The Dissertation Committee for Sarah Jey Whitehead certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

I THOUGHT WE *WEREN'T* IN SPAIN:

THE EMERGENCE OF AUTHENTICITY IN A FOREIGN

LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

Committee:

_____
Deborah K. Palmer, Supervisor

_____
Rebecca M. Callahan

_____
Noah De Lissovoy

_____
Elaine K. Horwitz

_____
Per Urlaub

I THOUGHT WE *WEREN'T* IN SPAIN:

THE EMERGENCE OF AUTHENTICITY IN A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

by

Sarah Jey Whitehead, B.A.; M.A.T.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin
May 2014

This dissertation is dedicated to
Conrad Beaulieu,
my first foreign language teacher.

Acknowledgements

There are many people who helped me complete this dissertation. First, I want to thank my advisor, Dr. Deborah Palmer. She has been the supreme combination of demanding and supportive, and I cannot imagine having gotten through this process without her. I also want to thank the other members of my committee, including Dr. Elaine Horwitz and Dr. Rebecca Callahan for their direction, feedback, and support from the time I entered this doctoral program. I also owe many thanks to Dr. Noah DeLissovoy, who gave me the tools and the independence to figure out where Foreign Language Education merges with Critical Theory. I owe Dr. Per Urlaub many thanks for his willingness to be on my committee without having had me as a student. I appreciate that risk on his part, and hope I have delivered.

I owe an enormous thank you to many faculty members at Bennington College who encouraged my scholarship while I was earning my undergraduate and Master's degrees: Thank you for teaching me how to think and how to create. Specifically, I owe a tremendous thank you to Dr. Peter Jones, whose course on conversation and discourse analysis hooked me as a sophomore in the fall of 2002. Peter has consistently made me feel like a genius, even though I suspect he is usually a step or two ahead of me. Also, I wish to give a warm and indebted thank you to Dr. Betsy Burris, who at Bennington College taught me so many things about education, teaching, pedagogy, and myself. I strive on a daily basis to be half the educator Betsy is.

Thank you to Ms. Mikes and the 7 students in Classroom 204 at First Street Middle School. This dissertation has come alive because of the dynamic community of your

classroom. Thank you also to the wider school community for being welcoming, and to the parents and administrators who were willing to let me do my work there.

Thank you to my friends, both graduate students and not, for listening to my ideas, and asking about my progress throughout this process. Knowing that you were supportive of me and interested in my progress helped me to sit down to work on more than one occasion. Thank you to Emily Spitzman, my first cousin who will be defending her dissertation in the field of ESL on the same week as my defense: Although you've been in Rhode Island, having a close friend at the same step of the process throughout has been an enormous help. Thank you also to all the members of my extended family for cheering me on at holidays and via email.

Thank you to my parents, Beth and Walter Whitehead. I could not imagine parents who are more supportive of anything and everything I decide to do with my life (including a move from New England to Texas). Thank you for setting me up for all the kinds of personal and academic success that I enjoy. Lastly, thank you to my sister, Hilary Dolan Whitehead: Your support and help mean so much to me. Thank you for engaging with me in an academic field that is not yours; your insight is always so valuable and smart. Thank you for staying up so late that night helping me to revise that course paper that now comprises much of Chapter 6. If and when you write a dissertation, I owe you a couple of favors.

I THOUGHT WE *WEREN'T* IN SPAIN: THE EMERGENCE OF AUTHENTICITY IN A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

Sarah Jey Whitehead, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

Supervisor: Deborah K. Palmer

This study is based upon the idea that foreign language (FL) classrooms exist apart from their target language communities. While historically, this has been a geographic truth, divides between FL learners and native speakers may also reflect symbolic social distance. Given the symbolic, if not geographic, isolation of the FL classroom from the real world, this study presumes that a challenge inherent to the endeavor of FL education is that the authentic, real-world language and culture under study are, by definition, not naturally present in the FL classroom. This study considers how this challenge, referred to as *the challenge of authenticity*, is managed in one FL classroom.

Seven eighth-grade students and their teacher comprise Classroom 204, a beginning Spanish FL classroom at a private school in the southwest U.S. This qualitative case study uses classroom observations, audio-recordings, classroom artifacts, and participant interviews as data to consider not only how authenticity is imported, imagined, and conjured by participants in Classroom 204, but how authenticity is assigned value therein.

Data is analyzed largely with discourse analysis of transcripts of classroom talk

about (and classroom talk that constituted) various facets of authenticity, value, and the real world. Ecology theory serves as a broad theoretical lens through which to understand (and accept) the complexity inherent to the social phenomena being researched. Benedict Anderson's (1991) theory of *imagined communities* is adopted to understand the boundaries that delineate the inside of the FL classroom from the outside, and Bourdieu's (1992) notion of *symbolic capital* is used to understand the ways by which authenticity becomes valuable (and, conversely, how that which is valuable becomes authentic).

Findings suggest that, while participants are largely oriented to real-world manifestations of Spanish language and culture, authenticity is not most present in Classroom 204 in the form of stuff imported from elsewhere. Rather, authenticity emerges out of the highly local, socially-immediate interactions and value systems unique to Classroom 204. Suggestions for both pedagogy and future research focus on approaches that acknowledge and capitalize on the power of local authenticity in the FL classroom, as cultivated by local social actors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

RATIONALE: THE CHALLENGE OF AUTHENTICITY

I can doodle on a piece of paper and draw an alien. It appears as if by magic. On the other hand, the absence and presence of the alien pushes us to recognize the limits of representation as that which exceeds 'our' knowledge. There is always the possibility that we might not recognize an alien if we see one: aliens may be alien to the very cultural imagination which allows them to appear as 'little green men' (Ahmed, 2000, p. 1).

Foreign languages (FLs) are included in many K-12 curricula in the United States, not only to help students develop proficiency in an additional language, but in order to help them cultivate an awareness of differing cultural views. The widely influential curricular guide issued by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL) reads that "such awareness will help combat the ethnocentrism that often dominates the thinking of our young people" (ACTFL, 1999, p. 47). Regardless of whether this judgment on young people is warranted, to appreciate the real-world richness of a foreign language (and culture) from the confines of a classroom is an impressive imaginative feat, that should not be taken for granted in any FL student population. Although FL curricula often purport to nurture emerging global awareness, there are various hurdles inherent to the very nature of FL education in the context of the United States (U.S.) that make this claim potentially quite challenging to realize.

The present study focuses on Spanish as an FL in a middle school classroom in the U.S. The goal of this chapter is to further consider FL education as an endeavor that is at once crucial and contrived, and to justify inquiry that seeks to understand FL

education as a contradictory space. This chapter first considers socio-political works in the field Second Language Acquisition (SLA), focusing specifically on how dichotomies central to the field have given rise to contradictory assumptions about language learning that have often gone overlooked. These contradictions are next examined in the context of Spanish in the U.S. Next, two theoretical challenges to FL education are presented: The challenge of terminology and the challenge of authenticity. The challenge of authenticity gives way to a research agenda, including research questions. The remainder of the chapter serves to explain the content of Chapters 2 through 9.

Deconstructing SLA's Dichotomies

In recent decades, various scholars have challenged SLA to reassess assumptions born out of what Crookes (1997) calls an uncritical "upbringing" (p. 100). More specifically, the paradigm within which SLA has traditionally operated has been critiqued by a number of theorists (see Crookes, 1997; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Kramsch, 2000; Larsen-Freeman, 1997, 2002; Ortega, 2005; Rampton, 1999; Sridhar, 1994; Valdés, 2005; von Hoene, 1995) as slow to accommodate the socio-political dynamics that are emerging as relevant to the field. Kramsch (2000) describes the wide variation in what is referred to as SLA, noting especially the continuum between cognitive language development and the broader socio-political issues that impact language learning. Rampton (1999) makes a compelling argument for the consideration of socio-political issues in SLA, in pointing out that there are "circumstances where... social, cultural, and ethnic border fences transect the zone of proximal development" (p. 335). Rampton (1999) also questions the simplicity of the distinction between formal and naturalistic

language learning, emphasizing instead the degree to which language is used authentically or meaningfully in any setting. Similarly, Leung, Harris, and Rampton (1997) and Kramsch (1997) both deconstruct the idealized native speaker, drawing from literature on bilingualism that questions the native/nonnative distinction.

These works collectively illuminate that the tendency in SLA to categorize and dichotomize may not only be a crude simplification of reality, but may indeed create a version of reality itself that, in effect, draws stark parallels between people (i.e. native/non-native) and types of language exposure (i.e. formal/naturalistic) that don't actually exist as a binary system. Larsen-Freeman (1997), who is preoccupied with the persistent social/cognitive divide in SLA (see Firth & Wagner, 1997; Gass, 1998), urges the adoption of an ecological lens (explained extensively in Chapter 2) that permits scholars "to see SLA as *both/and* rather than *either/or*" (Larsen-Freeman, 1997, p. 158, emphasis in original).

The most pertinent of the traditional SLA dichotomies to the present study is the foreign/second language distinction, which defines second languages as those spoken by the communities where they are taught, and foreign languages as those not spoken in the communities where they are taught. Lambert (1990) points out that the foreign/second language distinction is a social one, not based in linguistics. Sridhar (1994) deconstructs these categories, arguing that it is often the case that we hear "foreign" languages in our own communities, including where this study takes place. Sridhar's simple observation is very much aligned with Larsen-Freeman push to take a *both/and* approach in

understanding SLA-related phenomena. The following section thus considers how Spanish in the U.S. is a foreign language, while simultaneously being very much present.

Spanish as an FL in the U.S.

Reflected in the rampant labeling of it as "foreign," Spanish does not carry equal prestige as English in the U.S. Despite the respect granted to monolingual Anglo Americans who elect to develop proficiency in an additional language, the same admiration is not extended to those who are bilingual due to circumstance or necessity. Elective bilinguals are able to boast such an asset on their resumés, while Zentella (1997) points out that Spanish use in the workplace by native speakers has long been a point of contention. Valdés (1997) notes that monolingualism is erroneously assumed to be neutral in U.S. society, and VanLier (2011) insists that we resist the "prevailing sociopolitical doxa from neutering us into monolingualism" (p. 40). Valdés (1997) and Zentella (1997) both claim that language policy in the United States is monolingually biased not simply because of the dominant monolingual ideology, but because it is a way that policy can be anti-immigrant without appearing blatantly so. Tactics of covert racism around this issue can be identified, such as the labeling of Spanish as a "foreign" language in communities where it is actually quite prevalent.

At the university level, Nocon (1995) noted that white Anglo students of Spanish appeared to ignore the local Spanish-speaking populations and instead conjured imagined, generalized Spanish-speaking figures as linguistic models. This composite specter of native speaker served to indicate that students' understandings of their FL were based in something foreign, that was neither concrete nor immediate. In other words,

even despite the geographic proximity of a real-world Spanish-speaking population, students oriented to a specter of that population that existed largely in their own imaginations. Similarly, Valdés et al. (2003) interviewed the faculty of a Spanish Department at a post-secondary institution, and noted that nearby Spanish-speaking models were overlooked and ignored, and that a monolingual ideology pervaded the program. Both the pervasiveness of monolingualism and the subsequent distancing of FL students from the real-world Spanish population serve to illustrate the ways by which Spanish is constructed as an FL through symbolic means, independent of geographic proximity.

This section has considered how Spanish is a FL that is also highly present in the U.S., and has thus explored one contradiction of FL education at a global level (i.e. an institutional or societal level). The section that follows is also globally-oriented, considering relatively broadly the terminology surrounding FL education, particularly relating to how choices in terminology relate to the underlying socio-political platform of this project.

The Challenge of Terminology

One challenge to FL education is actually indexed in the very language surrounding the endeavor. Specifically, the terms *foreign language* and, alternately, *Languages Other than English* (LOTE) are both embedded in theoretical and socio-political contexts that potentially restrict the development of cultural awareness. The former term points to a challenge due to geographic and/or social distance; and the latter

term points to a challenge of linguistic capital. The discussion that follows will use both terms to further characterize these challenges.

As noted above, Sridhar (1994) points out that we often hear "foreign" languages in our own communities. Indeed, some scholars have argued that Spanish may be labeled as foreign to imply that does not belong (Hurtado & Rodriguez, 1989). The term *foreign* potentially triggers a presumption of inherent strangeness in the language being learned; the term *world languages* has been adopted by some secondary FL departments, presumably to avoid the contradiction of labeling something as *foreign* that students are meant to become familiar with. Both *foreign* and *world* position the language in question as somehow outside of the immediately local language context; in the case of Spanish in Texas, these are both problematic in that Spanish is very much present.

LOTE has been introduced as a term that, in many situations particularly in the U.S., is essentially interchangeable with FL. While it doesn't carry the same connotations as *foreign* or *world*, LOTE reflects the unmatched linguistic prestige of English in the world context: All languages (except for English) are grouped together based on the simple fact that they are not English. While this categorization is unsurprising, particularly given the academic hegemony of English, it uncovers two issues: Firstly, it mirrors Said's (1979) argument that the very stability of the imperial West rested on the imagined unity of both the West and the rest, whereas neither was actually categorizable as a unified whole. Secondly, the very hegemony of English is such that students who speak it as a first language don't have an obvious additional

language to covet.[1] A review of what English symbolizes in the global context reveals that it is, in actuality, an example of hegemonic power (that trumps any would-be competing language in the academic and business worlds) and it thus becomes a commodity (see Phillipson, 2009). The English-speaking world (and particularly for the purposes of this study, the English-speaking population of the United States) is already in possession of that "commodity," which almost certainly interferes with any drive to seek out an additional language (see Barnwell, 2008; Lambert, 1990, p. 325; Schumann 1976, p. 30). This stark socio-political difference between English language-learners world wide and native English speakers learning an FL in the U.S. is indeed reflected in the term LOTE.

The present study adopts the traditional term FL, neither to embrace nor to ignore the baggage that comes along with it, but in order to indicate a central interest of the current project, which seeks to understand how that which is "foreign" is handled in the FL U.S. context.

While the socio-political context of Spanish in the U.S. and debates surrounding FL terminology were categorized as global, the section that follows can be thought of as local. That is: It is cradled into the broader global contexts considered above, but is inevitably dealt with differently at each site by local social actors. Below, I offer a theoretical shell of one further challenge - the challenge of authenticity - which is central

[1] The 2007 Modern Language Association (MLA) report includes the argument that "in the context of globalization and in the post–9/11 environment… the usefulness of studying languages other than English is no longer contested" (p. 2). While educational (and other) institutions in the U.S. may urgently promote FL proficiency for these reasons, I argue that this urgency has yet to trickle down to the masses of monolingual native English speakers whose first language meets each of their quotidian needs.

to the premise of the current study. It is the intention of this project to rigorously investigate this challenge in the context of a beginning Spanish classroom.

The Challenge of Authenticity

As established above, within the field of SLA, FLs are defined as languages taught apart from the target language community, while second languages are taught within the communities in which they are spoken (see Block, 2003 for discussion). It is, in part, for this reason that Reagan and Osborn (2002) assert that language teaching is inevitably political, given its role in mediating connections between vast groups of people.

This project is largely dependent on this paradox of place: *That the real-worldness of Spanish, by definition, exists beyond the boundaries of the FL Spanish classroom.* Although FL education traditionally seeks to bridge groups of people both linguistically and culturally, the reality is that natural instances of FL use don't inevitably spill into the FL classroom; rather, they may have to be manufactured or invited therein. FL classroom participants are theoretically caught between a dearth of any real-world FL matter (a situation which may lead to simplified or erroneous conceptions of the language and the people who speak it), and a compulsion to import language and language-related-stuff piecemeal, in such a way that potentially reifies or stereotypes it.

Reagan and Osborn (2002) claim that FL education, as it currently operates in the United States, is actually based on the construct of foreignness, or the "conceptualization of the Others represented within and beyond foreign language curricula and instruction" (p. 85). In other words, although the degree to which Spanish can justifiably be

categorized as an FL in the state of Texas can be debated, the endeavor to teach it rests in part on the notion that Spanish comes from afar and thus represents something of interest to "the college bound populace and members of the dominant culture" (Reagan & Osborn, 2002, p. 86).

The challenge of authenticity for FL education also arises because the performative and preparatory nature of FL student discourse, and the familiar institutional classrooms in which learning takes place, aren't representative of real world Spanish. Indeed, the language of the FL classroom often fails to do a number of things that real-world language does, such as indexing and establishing social affiliations, and simultaneously shaping and reflecting social context (see Gee 1999 for discussion). Bauman and Sherzer's (1989) sense of performance aptly describes what FL student discourse often looks like: "The act of speaking is put on display, objectified, lifted out to a degree from its contextual surroundings and opened up to for scrutiny by an audience" (p. xix). Thus the persistent quest for authentic Spanish is a potential set-up for reified mutations of Spanish language and culture parading under the guise of authentic things.

Train (2007) notes a commonly heard question in the world of FL: "How do we make our content area… real for our students?" and warns that this question "asked in isolation from larger sociocultural, political, and historical contexts risks… distancing our pedagogic action from critical dialog" (p. 224). This study considers the processes by which things become real (or authentic) in an FL classroom, and inquiry is very intentionally situated in the sociocultural, political, and historical contexts Train

mentions. Couched in the global presupposition that Spanish carries a subaltern status in the linguistic landscape of the United States, this study takes up the local challenges of place and authenticity in the context of an 8th grade, Spanish FL classroom in the U.S. The following section introduces the research questions and briefly explains the methodology.

Research Agenda and Outline of the Dissertation

My first research question is:

1. In what ways do participants in a beginning 8th grade Spanish classroom manage the challenge of authenticity?

Further, presuming that the drive to capture authenticity in the FL classroom relates to an assumed value of the authentic, the relationship between authenticity and value is also of importance. Thus, an additional research question is:

2. In what ways is authenticity assigned value in a beginning 8th grade Spanish classroom?

This qualitative study makes use of discourse analysis to consider the ways by which authenticity is constructed and assigned value in a Spanish FL classroom in Texas. The participants in this classroom, which I call *Classroom 204,* were using a Spanish I curriculum and included seven eighth-graders and their teacher, Ms. Mikes. Data sources include five months of classroom observations and audio recording, supplemented with participant interviews and classroom artifacts. Analysis methods include a grounded approach to discourse analysis, in which I avoid a priori categories and instead focus on local constructions of authenticity. That I focus on local constructions of authenticity, as

it is recognized in Classroom 204, is key; I am neither a knower of authenticity, nor do I judge the authenticity that comes forth as such in Classroom 204. Harkening back to Ahmed's (2000) quote that opens this chapter, authenticity in the FL classroom is very much a social construction, and I am thus content to come to learn more about Classroom 204's analogue to Ahmed's "little green men". The remaining part of this chapter briefly outlines the content of each of the chapters that follow.

Chapters 2 and 3 together serve to establish my theoretical frame, and both review relevant empirical literature. While there is a sizable theoretical literature relating to the rationale of my study, there is a notable absence of empirical research about authenticity in the FL context. Surprisingly, there is also scant literature relating to FL classrooms at the K-12 level at all. Thus, Chapter 2 serves to position the FL classroom in the global context of society, while Chapter 3 focuses on the local inner workings of FL classrooms, and both address literature and theory.

Specifically, in Chapter 2 I introduce ecology theory as a lens through which FL classrooms in the U.S. may be understood. Ecology theory is based on the idea that all living things exist as part of interrelated (eco)systems. It is argued that human social patterns (or social ecosystems) can be understood through ecological tenets. Assuming an interrelatedness (and interdependence) between the FL classroom and its larger world, I take up the construct of *boundary* as a metaphor to understand where the FL classroom ends and where the real world begins, and how FL classroom actors mediate that process. The boundary metaphor also facilitates my exploration of the theoretical relationships between nations and language. The final portion of the chapter consists of a review of the

socio-political and socio-linguistic positions of Spanish in the U.S, and draws from literature on social and psychological distance in SLA.

The first half of Chapter 3 includes a review of how *imagined communities* have been considered in the context of language education, drawing first from data that relates to language student investment in their imagined communities, and second from studies of FL textbooks. The second half of Chapter 3 focuses on authenticity within the FL classroom, first as it relates to FL discourse and second as it relates to "language goods". Symbolic capital, authority and social proximity are also considered, particularly as they serve to explain a theoretical relationship between value and authenticity.

Chapter 4 first outlines the methodological theory, which merges ecology theory with the tradition of discourse analysis. The second half of this chapter outlines data collection and analysis methods.

Chapter 5 is the first of four findings chapters, and focuses on the ways by which participants in Classroom 204 construct spaces with their talk. Attention is given to the authenticity of talk as it relates to ritualized and/or rote verbal exchanges, the ways by which English and Spanish are (not) used authentically, and the ways "Mock Spanish" (explained in Chapter 5) is used in the classroom, for various reasons, and to various effects.

While Chapter 5 focuses on the ways by which talk creates spaces, Chapter 6 focuses more on the boundaries that delineate those spaces. Specifically this chapter focuses on talk that is authentic in Classroom 204 because it is aligned with participants' immediate social purposes. The data in this chapter are largely discourse examples from

student talk on Monday mornings, when they recount events from their weekend in Spanish. This discussion focuses on a number of variables in the emergence of discursive authenticity, including the predictability of the exchange, social speak versus school speak, and ways by which students are scaffolded by other participants to tell their stories. The chapter concludes with a section about *boundary clashes*, or the moments when it comes to light that classroom participants are operating under different assumptions about what is occurring in the classroom.

Chapter 7 focuses on the emergence of value in Classroom 204. Discussion first centers on how students tailor their language performance in order to meet certain grading criteria, at times producing language that is valuable in Classroom 204, but not necessarily so in the real world. This discussion focuses largely on *lempiras*, which are the in-class currency of Classroom 204, awarded for good language use, and good for cashing in to add points to quizzes and tests. The second half of the chapter shifts focus to the ways by which language competence may become valuable in the real-world. This analysis is largely based on a conversation in Classroom 204 about which Rosetta Stone Spanish program (Latin American or Iberian) will most benefit learner progress outside of class.

Chapter 8 focuses on information relevant to Spanish language and Latin-culture that isn't formally part of the curriculum. It tracks how participants in Classroom 204 bring in culturally relevant "language goods" and establish their social proximity to and expertise of the real-world through those goods. Claiming expertise in these instances are potentially high-stakes activities for students, in that if they claim expertise and cannot

follow through, they potentially lose face. Thus, negotiation and face-work in establishing social proximity to the "language goods" of the outside world play a prominent role in this chapter. A review of the types of language that students ought not to know (e.g. swear words) is also considered. The chapter concludes with a review of the authenticity of various "language goods" and the consequent social capital they make available to the students who claim ownership of them.

The concluding chapter of the dissertation characterizes the local authenticities in Classroom 204 as coming for from a series of spectra that relate to authenticity itself, in-class value, and social proximity. Pedagogical and research implications focus on attention to the local manifestations of authenticity in FL classrooms. Possibilities for future research are also explored.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND SOCIOPOLITICAL CONTEXTS

In this chapter it is my goal to introduce a series of interrelated theoretical concepts that are pertinent to the FL classroom as a space that is at once extremely intertwined with and irrefutably divorced from the real world. To start, I offer a brief explanation of ecology theory as a framework that both serves as the premise of the study, and unites the theoretical constructs I draw from throughout my analysis. Echoing Larsen-Freeman's (2002) justification of ecologically-informed theory as a means to mediate some of the polarities of SLA, I too make use of these ecological premises "not as a single grand unifying theory, but as a larger lens through which to view issues of interest" (p. 33). Out of my discussion on ecology theory emerges the notion of *boundary*, which, in turn, gives way to consideration of nations as imagined communities, followed by a review of the sociopolitical position of Spanish in the context of the U.S., and how that position relates to the language-learning process.

Ecology Theory

I use ecology theory to justify the theoretical premise of this project and to unite the theoretical constructs that, together, inform my data analysis. Ecology theory, also referred to as *systems theory*, is informed by the idea that all living entities exist interdependently as components of various self-organizing systems (Capra, 1996; Gleik, 1987; Maturana & Varela, 1987). Ecology as a natural science concerns itself with the self-organizing systems seen in the natural world. Multiple social theorists posit that the

same self-organizing properties found in nature are also found within human cognition (Damasio, 1994; Johnson, 1987; Maturana & Varela 1980, 1987; Varela, Thompson & Rosch, 1993) as well as throughout human social life (Bejan & Zane, 2013; Maturana & Varela 1987, 1980), including language (Haugen 1972; Leather & van Dam 2003; Maturana & Varela 1980, 1987). It is no coincidence that these similarities exist across phenomena, yet the similarities aren't attributed to an omnipotent designer: All living systems from Texas wildflowers, to schools of fish to the "social ecosystems" of the human world persist because they've evolved to share certain traits that ensure survival (VanLier, 2011, p. 32). One of many interconnected social ecosystems is, of course, education, and various scholars have adapted ecological tenets to consider this social endeavor (see Davis & Sumara, 2006; Oliver, 1989). Scholars situated in the field of SLA have argued that the discipline may be ecologically inclined (see Lam & Kramsch, 2003; Larsen-Freeman 2002; Leather & van Dam 2002, 2003; van Lier 2002, 2011). Two crucial ecological tenets will now be explained; these explanations will be accompanied by discussion of the ways by which ecology theory has been considered in the fields of SLA and FL education.

Emergence

The notion of *emergence* is key to ecology theory. Much of the scholarly work around emergence, particularly in the fields of learning and cognition, focuses on the notion that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts: that phenomena such as intelligence, consciousness, love, and even life cannot be manufactured. Within the field of language learning both Larson-Freeman (2002) and van Lier (2002) critique the

widespread assumption that language learning is "an accumulation of bits and pieces until they are all in place" (van Lier, 2002, p. 159). Both scholars note the predominant reductionist approaches in the field of language education, and Larson-Freeman argues that the nonlinear, living nature of language is a fact that cannot be dismantled for the convenience of teaching, learning, research, or theory. Rather, it is out of a holistic system in all of its various embedded contexts that language and language proficiency emerge.

The holistic emphasis in approaching educational and language-learning phenomena from an ecological perspective is largely rooted in the understanding that it is the relationships between various parts of a system, rather than the parts alone that matter. Then, emergence also refers to the idea that each component to a system, as well as each system itself, is meaningful only in the context of that which makes it what it is: For example, a queen bee is only a queen bee because of her position in relation to other bees. Her identity is what ecology theorists call *groundless*, in that it is not pertinent without the surroundings that permit that role to emerge (Maturana & Varela, 1987). Similarly, "teacher" is an emergent role that doesn't follow anyone through life; it depends on the people by whom one is surrounded and the interactions that occur for *doing* teaching to actually happen (Cazden, 2001, p. 40). And, of course, languages come to be labeled as "foreign" not because they are inherently so, but because of their political and linguistic surroundings (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996).

Following Reagan and Osborn (2002), I acknowledge the necessity to focus on FL teaching methodologies, but am also committed to "[addressing] the social, cultural,

political, and ideological contexts in which we teach, and in which languages are used" (p. 138). In fact, my position is that the inner workings of the FL classroom become pertinent and relevant *only* when we understand the world that brings them about. Edward Said's (1993) contrapuntal analysis follows very much the same assumption:

> In practical terms, 'contrapuntal reading,'… means reading a text with an understanding of what is involved when an author shows, for instance, that a colonial sugar plantation is seen as important to the process of maintaining a particular style of life in England (p. 66).

Similarly, Said (1993) asks: "Who in Britain or France can draw a clear circle around British London or French Paris that would exclude the impact of India and Algeria upon those two imperial cities?" (p. 15). Much as imperial London cannot be understood apart from its historical colonies, the FL classroom cannot be fully understood without the various communities out of which it has emerged. The world beyond the classroom is integral to the emergence of the classroom; and, indeed, each individual classroom is, in part, integral to giving way to a re-constructed global world. The interplay between global and local settings is crucial to understanding the emergence of those settings themselves (Bourdieu, 1977; Erickson, 2004; Gee, 1999), and many aspects of my analysis focus on various manifestations of that interplay. Given the importance of the larger sociopolitical context to the local setting of a single classroom, it

is one of my goals of this chapter, and of the one that follows, to adequately review those greater contexts.

Mutual Adaptation

A second key tenet of ecology theory is mutual adaptation. Every unique classroom environment emerges out of the interplay between how traditional classroom norms (and the institutions that may uphold them) give way to students, and how students give way to their classroom. In a theoretical piece that considers the FL classroom through an ecological lens, VanLier (2011) notes:

> Very few places are accepted exactly for what they are, and teachers and learners, similar to organisms in nature, adapt, reconstruct, and change in various ways the place that is the niche candidate (or niche designate) and turn it into a proper niche for themselves, one that fits them and one that they fit into (pp. 33-4).

The local-global interplay actually comprises a social system itself, in that various global expectations (e.g. traditional schooling norms) are appropriated, adapted, and otherwise made use of at the local level (e.g. a specific interaction in a specific classroom). Many similar local adaptations that don't conform to the global norm may, in time, re-construct an adjusted global norm. The local and global are interdependent in that each is affected by the other, each affords the other a certain amount of wiggle room, and their relationship permits both to subsist. This process of mutual adaptation is also referred to as *structural coupling*, or the process by which multiple entities adjust to complement the structures outside of themselves (i.e. one another) that provide a mutual good fit. This is the premise of evolution theory (simplified versions of which too often

omit the role of environment), but it is also the pattern of interpersonal interactions in that we as humans constantly adapt to and enact on our social surroundings in order to develop mutual compatibility with others, so that the social systems of which we are a part are sustainable. Linguistic grammars, for example, are mutually adaptive in language communities, permitting those communities to come forth as such, and to refine their mutual intelligibility among members (Larsen-Freeman, 1997). Similarly, Leather & van Dam (2003), in the introduction to their edited volume titled *Ecology of Language Acquisition*, call for a theory of language whose premise is that "linguistic knowledge is not *given* but adaptively *achieved* by the individual in the environment" (p. 19). In other words, language proficiency emerges in various moments through successful navigation of (and co-adaptation with) one's linguistic environment.

One additional tenet of ecology theory, which perhaps has become self-evident, is that systems operate as self-enclosed entities, but are also nested in (and come forth from) various other entities. The exchange between the inside and the outside of the FL classroom, and how the FL classroom comes forth out of its larger institutional and socio-political contexts, both pull my attention towards that which actually distinguishes the inside from the outside. The following insight of van Lier (2003) is an apt explanation of how the notion of boundary becomes so important to this project:

> In an ecological view, there never is a one-way direction of information, innovation or improvement: relationships are always reciprocal. The most exciting creation of new ideas always happens at the boundaries between systems, in interaction (p. 62).

The theoretical purpose of the current project is to investigate the FL classroom as a site where FLs are used (or handled) in a space that is necessarily apart from their real-world contexts. The FL space is connected to the real world (indeed, depends on it) for the stuff of the curriculum (if the FL weren't being spoken by real people in real places, what would be the point?), and yet is decidedly apart from that world (if it were part of it, students likely wouldn't need instruction in the FL, because they would speak it). Then, the boundaries that set the FL classroom apart from the world become integral to understanding how the FL locale emerges out of its greater social contexts, and how the players within the FL classroom negotiate the ways that the FL is connected to and divorced from that real world. The next section considers boundaries as key to understanding the symbolic and concrete space of the FL classroom.

Boundaries

Often mistaken for a fixed reality, boundaries are more commonly metaphorical in nature, and will be treated as such here. Essentially, I argue that established boundaries, as we refer to them, are actually façades that permit people to partition various parts of their worlds, for various cognitive and social reasons (Bourdieu, 1992). Most importantly, these façades aren't static, but are continually constructed by both internal and external actors in order to establish what constitutes any given space. While there are physical boundaries to the FL (or any) classroom, the boundaries referred to throughout this piece, unless otherwise noted, are those that are constructed through various modes of social negotiation both within and outside of the FL classroom. It is not enough to explore FL classroom participant ties to the real world beyond his/her

classroom. Rather, it is crucial to see how the real world *emerges* or *comes forth* for participants through their partnership in co-constructing their classroom: FL participants' relationships with the real world change, depending on what boundaries are drawn; and the FL experiences change depending on what does or does not transcend those boundaries, and how.

In his theoretical piece on FL classrooms as ecological niches, van Lier (2011) characterizes the classroom as a place from which students:

> (1) venture forth and hunt for language stuff and (2) bring back language stuff to share, savor, and digest. The venturing forth and bringing back can be seen literally, virtually, or symbolically (p. 34).

Symbolic boundaries emerge, in part, out of movement across them and in how the language stuff is treated on either side. Boundaries are thus continually under construction by both internal and external actors in order to establish (and re-establish) what constitutes the FL classroom sphere. The topic of "language stuff" itself as something that does (or does not) cross FL boundaries is discussed further in Chapters 3 and 8.

This social negotiation of boundaries, by both individuals and groups, is key to understanding how the construct of boundary serves this project. Indeed, it is actually boundary-making, rather than the boundaries themselves that sheds light upon how FL classroom actors conceive of the various pockets of their social realities: It sheds light upon the temporal, spatial, and symbolic spaces that separate or connect FL students and their native speaking interlocutors. Key to the boundary-making (and boundary-

transcending) processes are conceptions of who and what lie beyond those boundaries, and how those people and their various cultural artifacts (language included) can be characterized, imported, and appropriated for FL learning purposes. This might look like a native speaker being invited into the classroom to be "interviewed" by students, or an in-class celebration of *el día de los muertos*; it also might be far more subtle, such as a photograph of a Mexico City restaurant menu nestled into the corner of a textbook, or a student question about how text messaging language is used by Spanish speaking teenagers.

Oftentimes, learning an FL goes hand and hand with learning about a country (or a group of countries) where the language is spoken. That nations each have their corresponding languages is a widespread, unexamined, and often faulty assumption (see Haugen 1972), which appears to be surprisingly persistent, even in FL contexts where the "foreign" language is present in the local community. Von Hoene (1995) critiques common FL practices of exploring cultural difference, stating that typically, those differences are "based on a national, monolithic fiction" (p. 43). She cautions that the endeavor of FL teaching may even perpetuate these national fictions. The section that follows reviews theoretical work that has been done into the construct of *nation*, a space that is, of course, delineated by boundaries. This review will serve not only to illustrate how communities emerge into being, but how language plays an important role in that process, which is key to understanding the sociopolitical position of Spanish as a language in the U.S.

Nations and Language

Bourdieu (1992) writes that "to institute, to give a social definition, an identity, is also to impose *boundaries*" (p. 120, emphasis in original). Perhaps one of the clearest manifestations of this truth is in the establishment of nations. The discussion that follows considers the ways by which nations are imagined into being, focusing specifically on the roles that language plays in this process, and culminates in a discussion on what this means for the Spanish language in the context of the United States.

In his seminal book titled *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson (1991), argues that both nationhood and nationalism are cultural artifacts, products of the process of delineating of boundaries around a nation. In essence, Anderson claims that the nation becomes real only because the *fantasy* of a bounded, sovereign and fraternal nation is sustained through concrete aspects of reality. Anderson's examples include national anthems, museums, maps, the census, etc; and Bourdieu (1992) adds emblems, flags, and badges to the list (p. 220). Similarly, critical scholar Ahmed (2000) notes that, since the specter of a nation brings along with it a series of very real "material effects," it becomes quite easy to accept the fantasy as a very real "organising assumption" of our everyday lives (p. 98). According to Ahmed, one of these "effects" is the people who become the strangers against whom our nations (and other groupings) are identified.

Julia Kristeva, a well known philosopher situated in feminist psychoanalytic traditions focuses on the role that foreigners play in the construction of nationalism, posing the question in 1991 (p. 125) of whether a society without foreigners is even possible, and answering herself in 1993 (p. 50) that hypothetical groups of people without

foreigners are necessarily also without nations. In her works, Kristeva notes the perceived threat that foreigners (or "others") pose to national independence; Ahmed notes how this threat is made use of to promote insidership and nationalism among those who belong.

Thus, Ahmed (2000) claims that "the production of nation... involves the projection of boundaries, " a process, she claims, which is "not simply geographical or geopolitical... but also discursive" (p. 98). One of the principle ways by which it is determined who and what belongs (or doesn't belong) is through *language*, yet another of the material effects listed above. In fact, Anderson (1991) characterizes the idea of *nation* as a "community imagined through language" (p. 146). Kristeva (1993) even argues that a nation can be a language act, its identity emerging out of the various literatures and discourses of its citizens (p. 44; see also Bhabha, 2013).

Both Bourdieu (1992) and Anderson (1991) emphasize the importance of the belief in a *standard* language in the creation of the idea of *nation*. Specifically, Bourdieu notes that forming a nation makes it pressing to create a standard language, so that impersonal and official things can happen; and Anderson explains how the advent of highly accessible printed language contributed to the fixed nature of language, particularly the language of those with enough power to get their ideas into print. Pioneer language ecologist Haugen (1972) notes that with the advent of print, standardization of schooling, and the rise of industry, "every self-respecting nation has to have a language," a norm that he argues is important to the self-realization of the idea of *nation*, but far from how things actually work (p. 244).

Mary Louise Pratt (1991) explains that language holds up the specter of nation, particularly the perception that there is some "homogenous competence of grammar shared identically and equally among all members" (p. 37). This, in turn, creates power differentials between those who speak the version of the language that is considered to be standard, and those who don't. In other words, heterogeneity of language does not work to deconstruct the misperception that a standard exists, but serves to create hierarchies of social power, authority, and, of course, discrimination against those whose language is not the national favorite (see Lippi-Green, 2012, particularly chapters 4 & 14).

Hornberger (2002) and Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas' (1996) work is part of a larger literature in the field of bilingualism that operates on the notion of an "ecology of language" (see Haugen, 1972) that presumes evolution, co-existence, and co-adaptation of languages that are in contact with one another. In other words, multilingual contexts are not problemetized (as they are from a monolingual perspective), but are accepted and explored as a commonplace social phenomenon. Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) offers the term *linguicism* to refer to any "ideologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (material and immaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language" (p. 13). Similarly, Anderson (1991) calls moves by (linguistic) power groups who feel threatened by marginalized (linguistic) communities *linguistic nationalisms* (pp. 109-10). In their review of language policies in the context of both the United Nations and Europe, Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1996) argue that language policy is highly telling of "how education systems and society at large encourage or subdue languages and

identities" (p. 432). In this section I have attempted to explain how nations emerge through language, and how perceptions around language lay the groundwork for some language groups to have more social capital than others. While the above theoretical discussion informs my local inquiry, and will be utilized throughout my findings chapters, it also sheds much light upon my global context. I now turn to some specifics regarding Spanish, a marginalized language within the context of the U.S.

Monolingual Bias and the Histories of Spanish in the U.S.

It is widely accepted that each nation comes along with its language, a symptom of the Western monolingual ideologies that pervade a largely bilingual world (Blanton 2004; Haugen 1972; Hornberger 2002; Leather & van Dam 2003; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1996; Valdez 1997; Zentella 1997). The notion that nationalism and patriotism emerge out of a single, cohesive language used by all citizens, accounts for the perceived threat that non-dominant languages pose to the integrity of a nation (Bourdieu 1992). This section builds on that basic premise, while adding that it is not only the dominant language, but the *monolingually* conceived-of dominant language that holds the most social power.

In the U.S., monolingual English holds the most symbolic capital. Spanish-English bilingualism, particularly among circumstantial bilinguals, is sometimes framed as an obstacle to a monolingual-like purity of English: Any intermingling of the two languages in the mind of the bilingual speaker is mistakenly thought to compromise the integrity and sovereignty of each language (see Anzaldúa, 1987, Chapter 5; Lippi-Green, 2012; Valdés, 1997; Valdés & Figueroa 1994). In other words, bilingual English does not

contribute to the realization of cohesive nation as monolingual English does. This belief is representative of the monolingual ideologies prevalent in the U.S. One way by which monolingual bias in U.S. society can be uncovered is by considering the long tradition of "Americanization" of immigrants in U.S. public schools.

Americanization in Public Schools

United States public education has long taken on the responsibility not only to educate students in core academic subjects but to prepare students to be contributing citizens to a democratic society (Tyack, 1974). While the sentiment of this endeavor may be noble on an abstract level, in practice this has meant that schools have been the sites of assimilation and normalization for the myriad immigrant groups who have arrived in the time period after White Anglos themselves immigrated and established themselves as the dominant class. Historically, the blatant anti-immigrant policies and practices have been astounding: Schools were essentially thought of as filters in place to ensure that children of immigrants were taught to be acceptable Americans (Blanton, 2004; González, 1999; Lambert 1990; San Miguel & Valencia, 1998; Tyack, 1974). Lambert (1990) argues that second language learning in the U.S. (i.e. English as a Second Language) is largely designed as a way to get immigrants into the "American mold" and "to help them wash out as quickly as possible old country ways and old country languages" (p. 323).

Presently, one of the most common attributes of an "acceptable" American is command of the English language. This manifestation of linguistic supremacy actually appears to be a contemporary "solution" to the "immigrant problem": to assimilate Spanish speakers into mainstream American culture, thus potentially stripping them of

their Spanish in the process. In fact, Zentella (1997) and Valdés (1997) both make the claim that monolingually-oriented policies such as these are the contemporary versions of anti-immigrant sentiments that are no longer acceptable. Similarly, Kinginger (2004) argues that there is no official national policy regarding FL education in the U.S., perhaps because such a policy "would require an unambiguous and unbiased statement on the value of multilingual competence" (p. 221).

Educational Disparities Between Spanish and English

The educational rift between native Spanish and native English speakers in the United States has long been severe (Blanton, 2004; González, 1999; San Miguel & Valencia, 1998). Valdés (1998, 2000) and Gifford and Valdés (2006) have noted the disparity in academic capital between monolingual English students and their Spanish-English bilingual peers. Similarly, Valdés, Gonzalez, García, and Márquez (2003) did a study based on the related premise that hegemonic language ideologies that prize monolingual-like linguistic competence pervade FL departments in higher education. This study, which used interviews of Spanish faculty and graduate student participants for its primary data, uncovered participant assumptions about the integrity of Spanish from different countries; assumptions appeared to be related to those countries' political stability, indigenous populations, and global social status, as perceived in the U.S. Interestingly, of the 43 participants interviewed, only one person mentioned Spanish as an academic language in the U.S. Valdés et al. related this finding to their observation that "much attention is given in many foreign language departments to protecting the language from contamination from the English that surrounds them and to providing a

model of a standard target language free of vulgar colloquialisms and popular jargon" (p. 8). Similarly, Barnwell (2008) notes heritage Spanish speakers' willingness to be placed in beginning level Spanish FL classes, based on the belief that their Spanish is somehow inferior, and Train (2007) argues that standardization of language plays a role in (re)creating social inequalities. Practices such as these, Valdés et al. claim, are influenced by a nationalist aesthetic (see Thomas, 1991) fixated on essentialist characteristics of language and culture as they represent a given nation, and dependent on the notion of a standardized linguistic citizenry.

A contradiction arises here, of course, in the sense that previously monolingual Anglo students who elect to develop proficiency in Spanish can boast this on their résumés, while circumstantial (i.e. due to social circumstance) Spanish-English bilinguals are not regarded with the same respect and admiration. This may be related to the "non-standard" English that Spanish-English bilinguals employ, which holds less prestige. Linguistic deviations from the "standard" in general, but particularly those that include "foreign" accents and seemingly deviant grammatical constructions, lead to what Zentella (1997) refers to as "Hispanophobia," which stigmatizes Latino users of English as somehow less democratic, likely because any variety their English presents is feared to compromise national cohesion. Lambert (1990) notes not only that ESL in the U.S. is a matter of social survival for Spanish speakers, but emphasizes that, by contrast, FL in the U.S. aims "to civilize and refine the American character…. To prepare American young people to be sojourners, tourists, or visitors" (p. 324). Thus, while Spanish speakers are

pushed toward monolingual English for everyday survival, monolingual English speakers are trained as part of cultured world citizens on the international stage.

Kinginger (2004) aptly sums up the situation I've attempted to outline above: "Speakers of languages other than English must be assimilated, for their competence is dangerous and divisive. Foreign Language instruction may then be reserved for the monolingual elite who have already been Americanized" (p. 221). FL students in the U.S. are ones who have the means to travel in order to use their languages; their emerging multi-competence is a potential luxurious add-on to their monolingually-intact English competence; this type of bilingualism is set apart from the strain of multi-competence that emerges out of social circumstance.

It is no coincidence that the United States is home to one of the world's largest Spanish speaking populations, and that, just the same, Spanish is characterized as a threat to the prevailing power of English (Barnwell, 2008; Nocon, 1995). Indeed, it is the undeniable presence of Spanish in many communities in the U.S. that probably provokes the implicit anti-immigrant and anti-bilingual backlash that can be seen in policy. Spanish, although highly prevalent in the Texas community in which the present study takes place, is even characterized as a "foreign language" by the Texas Education Agency (2010), simply because it is not English.[2] Considering Osborn's (2000) discussion of how the construct of foreignness functions as an integral cornerstone to the endeavor of FL education in the United States, we begin to see more clearly how the dynamic of

[2] The Texas Education Agency (TEA) typically uses LOTE to describe the second/foreign language requirement; however, their website specifically says that, for the purposes of the graduation requirement, that "any language other than English is considered a foreign language".

rendering everything non-English as foreign plays out in specific contexts. In South Texas, for example, Hurtado and Rodriguez (1989) note that in their research site just miles from the Mexico border, Spanish was labeled a Foreign Language, reinforcing "Spanish-speaking students' status as foreigners" (p. 410). The constructs of social distance and social proximity between learners and native speakers of an FL are considered next, in the final section of this chapter.

Social Distance and Social Proximity in Language Learning

As noted at the start of this chapter, all language learning necessarily takes place in a larger social context. There is substantial theoretical and empirical literature considering the relationships between student attitudes towards the target language (TL) learning community and student language acquisition (Gardner & Lambert 1972; Gardner 1985; Lambert 1990; Schumann 1978; Spolsky 1989). Schumann's (1978) *acculturation model* is based upon the premise that language acquisition relates to student relationships with the TL community. Schumann focuses on natural (usually second) language learning, and thus argues that it is specifically acculturation on the part of the student that is wrapped up in progress in language acquisition. Spolsky (1989) critiques Schumann's model, saying that it is hard to test, to generalize, and that it cannot necessarily apply to various contexts, but he notes the great import of its emphasis on social factors (pp. 142-6). Then, it is Schumann's constructs of *social distance* and *social proximity* (to a TL community) that I will adopt for my analysis. Unlike Schumann, I am not particularly interested in my participants' language progress with respect to their relationships to the

TL community; rather, I am interested in the construction of those relationships themselves.

In order to gauge social distance and social proximity, Schumann (1978) considers a variety of factors, one of which is *enclosure*. Enclosure, he explains, "refers to the degree to which the [second language learning] group and the TL group share the same churches, schools, clubs, rec-facilities, crafts, professions, and trades" (p. 30). The higher the degree of enclosure, the more separate the social groups in question are. In the region in which this study takes place, for instance, the Spanish speaking and English speaking populations have relatively high enclosure, which is indicative of basic social distance. While Schumann explains that all learners exist somewhere on a continuum of social distance and social proximity, it isn't entirely clear the extent to which Schumann views this position as static and/or co-constructed. Thus, for the purposes of this study, I not only conceive of a continuum of social distance/proximity, but assume specifically that *at any given moment* all students are collaboratively settling into their respective places on the continuum. This is actually one manifestation of boundary-making in that students are agents in determining what is constructed as close (inside), and what is kept at a distance (outside).

To close this chapter, I will briefly explain a mixed methods study by Nocon (1995) that considers the construct of social distance, as it relates to Spanish in the U.S. Through observation and surveys that elicited both quantitative and qualitative responses, Nocon considered the social distance between Spanish university students and their TL community/communities in California. Like Hurtado & Rodriguez (1989), she suggests

that the geographical proximity of a lower-prestige language such as Spanish actually sparks substantial symbolic social distance for the University students. Specifically, she found that the University students (a privileged, largely monolingual population) appeared to overlook (or ignore) the local speakers of Spanish, suggestive of "social distancing from the 'known other' in favor of what appears to be a more positive generalized stereotype associated with 'Spanish speaker'" essentially allowing FL students "to study a language divorced from its local speakers" (p. 48).

Open response questions and survey items regarding the terms "Mexican," "Spanish Speaker," "Hispanic" and "Spain" evoked various responses from students: Some were offended at the very use of the term "Mexican," which consistently rated lower than "Spanish Speaker" on an attitude scale. "Hispanic" and "Spain" were most often associated with culture and travel, one student stating that his FL studies might involve going to "'the country'" (p. 61). While Spanish was spoken in the community of this study, Nocon wonders whether the closest manifestations of the FL render it less authentically foreign (and perhaps, by extension, less valuable to the FL endeavor). While the preoccupation with foreignness (and authenticity, and value) are extensively addressed in Chapter 3, I close this chapter with Nocon's simple argument that "focusing on the 'foreign' in Spanish language instruction delegitimizes U.S. Spanish speakers in favor of those who speak Spanish at a safe distance, that is, abroad" (p. 63).

Conclusion

This Chapter has attempted to situate the Spanish speaking community in its socio-political context in the US, drawing from ecology theory, and specifically

considering the symbolic power of boundaries and language in shaping communities. It has also introduced the constructs of *boundary* and *social proximity*, which will be made use of in analysis. While this chapter has tended largely to the challenge of place and has focused on the broader social context of my study, the chapter that follows focuses on the boundaries and imagined communities involved in FL classrooms, and ultimately takes up the constructs of *authenticity, foreignness, and value.*

CHAPTER 3

LOCAL MANIFESTATIONS OF THE THEORETICAL FRAME

In Chapter 2, I introduced ecology theory to justify the trajectory of this project. I then explained the socio-political context of Spanish as an FL in the U.S. from an ecological standpoint, making use of Anderson's (1991) theory of imagined communities, and focusing on the phenomenon of boundary-making. In the present chapter, I continue with the boundary metaphor. In this chapter, I first consider imagined communities as they relate to language classrooms. The second half of the chapter considers the authenticity of talk and the authenticity of "language stuff," and ultimately connects the constructs of authenticity and value in a discussion that explains symbolic capital, authority, and social proximity.

Imagined Communities and the FL Classroom

To engage in the act of FL learning or teaching without invoking those who speak the FL beyond the classroom walls is unlikely if not undesirable. The Spanish FL classroom, then, necessarily is in symbolic, if not actual, contact with the people, the discourses, and the cultural artifacts (collectively referred to as "language stuff" or "language goods") that come along with the Spanish language. This section illustrates how connections between people are not necessarily founded in observable, concrete physical spaces, and thus considers how FL classroom participants may perceive boundaries around (imagined) communities that actually transcend the four walls of the FL classroom.

The two sections that follow review some of the most present literature that links imagined communities to the field of FL education: First, Norton's work into language learner investment and imagined communities is introduced, and next a review of the imagined worlds brought forth by FL textbooks.

Investment in Imagined Community: Experiences in the ESL Classroom

The works of Norton (2001) and Kanno and Norton (2003) are largely centered on the idea of imagined communities. Specifically, these scholars consider participation among students of English as a second language (ESL). Norton (2001) operates under the assumption that language learning is often a means to a real world end, and that language classrooms therefore mediate between learners and their wider communities of practice (those that already exist, such as a student's current job, or those that might at one point exist, such as the job a student may qualify for with improved English skills). As these communities don't exist concretely in a foreign language classroom, they are conjured by individual learners for different reasons, across different spatial and temporal realms, depending on students' language learning motives.

Norton (2001) notes that high participation among ESL students corresponds with a strong sense of language learning purpose that could become useful in a near or imagined future outside of the classroom, so long as that purpose was fostered and respected within the classroom. Students with strong visions of making use of their language competence in meaningful communities whose teachers didn't share this vision tended to lose interest in progressing linguistically. Similarly, Lantolf and Genung's (2002) case study participant focused exclusively on classroom-centric success, and cut

herself off from any imagined trajectory that extended beyond the classroom after disagreeing with her teacher. Further, some empirical work has noted that students become disillusioned once contact with their once-imagined communities is realized. For instance, in Kinginger's (2004) four-year case study of Alice, a college student with a low socioeconomic background who paid her way through college, Alice's initial romanticized versions of France didn't align with her actual experience abroad, causing her to become deeply depressed. Similarly, Kanno and Norton (2003), noted a Japanese-Canadian student's high motivation to learn Japanese until he visited Japan and the real Japanese society didn't correspond with his imagined Japanese society, and he became disillusioned: "The important point," write Kanno and Norton (2003) is that "investment in the target language… can be understood in the context of future affiliations and identifications, rather than prevailing sets of relationships" (p. 244). The present study makes use of this premise, and pushes beyond it in considering the ways by which FL participants construct symbolic boundaries around their present and future uses of Spanish, and around partitions of the Spanish-speaking world.

Texts and Imagined Worlds

Norton's (2001) and Kanno and Norton's (2003) work has largely centered on how imagined communities are created for individual students, and how in-class and real-world experiences support, dismantle, or otherwise challenge those visions. While student anticipation of real-life FL use is central to the current study, there is also a modest literature on the ways by which texts constitute and promote certain imagined FL worlds. It's accepted that curricular materials hold a substantial amount of power in

shaping student understandings of material (Apple, 2004). Regarding imagination, Pavlenko and Norton (2007) note that, based on Anderson's (1991) notion of imagination as a social process, it's social authorities that "do the imagining for the rest of their fellow citizens, offering them certain … options and leaving others 'unimaginable' (p. 670). Then, materials in FL instruction are particularly interesting in that they "possess a unique authority to construct and mediate alternative cultural and linguistic worlds, in fact, 'imagining' them for the students" (Shardakova & Pavlenko, 2004, p. 28). Based on this premise, a number of scholars have done critical inquiry into the worlds and speakers brought forth by various FL and second language texts (see Cook, 2013; Kinginger, 2004; Kramsch & von Hoene, 2001; Ndura, 2004; Shardakova & Pavlenko, 2004; Train, 2007).

The world portrayed in FL and second language texts has been widely critiqued as over-simplified (see Cook 2003, 2013; Ndura 2004; Shardakova & Pavlenko 2004). Shardakova and Pavlenko (2004) voice a concern that simple language too easily creates simplified FL textbook worlds, and Cook (2003) echoes this concern, noting that texts offer "a sanitized world of clean-living teenagers" (p. 278). In her critical analysis of ESL texts, Ndura (2004) draws from Sadker and Sadker's (2001) work on gender bias in texts to explain some of her findings: Namely, she adopts Sadker and Sadker's notions of unreality and invisibility. Unreality offers an apt term to describe the simplification of FL worlds that is so widely noted. In Sadker and Sadker's (2001) words, unreality is a way by which "controversial topics are glossed over… in favor of a more fanciful, favorable, and traditional view" (p. 136). Cook (2013, p 253) somewhat facetiously

refers to the number of smiling faces per page of FL texts as the "smile factor" and Cook (2003) notes that a text's smile factor is indicative of whether a text represents the complexities of real life, the majority of which, he argues, do not. He critiques the unreality of adult texts, sarcastically stating "learning another language is apparently a way of joining this happy group, not of taking an adult… role in the world" (p. 277).

The second construct identified by Ndura (2004), invisibility, is essentially bias by omission. Ndura critiques the ESL texts that she reviewed, noting the "missing, misconstrued and misrepresented voices" (p. 143). The notion of invisibility is, then, particularly pertinent to the groups of target language speakers who don't make an appearance in textbooks. Train (2007), for example notes that in the Spanish language text he analyzed, "working-class and poor Hispanics are written out of the text's… view of reality" and are "textually absent but implicitly positioned as… deficient" (p. 224). Similarly, one of Shardakova & Pavlenko's (2004) research questions was centered around which target language speakers students will "presumably encounter," according to the text, and which speakers were absent, and ultimately found that all interlocutors presented in the two Russian language texts in their study were almost exclusively middle class (p. 30). Nocon's (1995) research questions, from the study outlined at the end of Chapter 2, also focused on the native speakers that FL students were (not) imagining up: "With whom do… English-dominant students plan to communicate in Spanish?" (p. 47). So, not only will imagined communities be drawn that stretch beyond the FL classroom and around some NSs, but those boundaries will very likely also exclude other NSs.

In Anderson's (1991) work on imagined communities and Ahmed's (2000) work on strangers, both scholars note that there will always exist not only *others*, but *other* others: The *other* others are presumably those target language speakers presently excluded from texts. Further, Kramsch and von Hoene (2001) critique the portrayal of native speakers in three German texts as "quaint characters in a fictional narrative, not… incarnations of real-life native speakers" (p. 294). Thus, not only are some NSs subtly excluded from texts, but seemingly neutral ones are distilled into potentially stereotypical figures that compound the unreality of the texts.

Shardakova and Pavlenko (2004) considered not only the TL speakers that the texts portrayed, but the FL learner characters, noting that both books' protagonists were male, white, heterosexual, coupled, able-bodied and white collar professionals. In other words, the books promoted standardized interlocutors, both in their portrayal of NSs and FL students. Cook (2003) noted a similar one-dimensionality of the ways student FL users were portrayed in texts, noting that their roles always related to their learner status, be they students, visitors, or tourists. And, in explaining the ways by which her French textbook failed to align with her French students, Kinginger (2004) uses a question posed by a student: " 'Comment dit-on *trailer park*. 'Cause I don't live in no, like, château'" (p. 225). The francophone world promoted in that text didn't align with students' real experiences; some, such as Alice mentioned above, may have suspended that misalignment and accepted that in the text's "version of France, there is no misery: no slums, no poverty… no trailer parks" (p. 227).

This type of clash between students' own experiences and a text's imagined world harkens back to Norton's (2001) work with imagined communities, in which she attributes student non-participation to a "disjuncture" between student and teacher imagined language goals (p. 70). While the disjunctures Norton refers to caused some ESL students to check-out of their studentship, in my analysis I will consider what I will call "boundary clashes" that don't have a grand effect, but that come to the surface as momentary miscommunications that call for renegotiation of the spatial, temporal, and symbolic spaces participants are operating within, and the boundaries that encapsulate them.

An example of such a boundary clash from the empirical literature comes from van Dam's (2003) study of two Dutch students of English. When the girls were called on to make a sentence with the verb *disappear*, they appeared unable to do so. Their teacher offered a sentence that integrated the girls' interest in the *Lord of the Rings*: "Frodo Balings[3] disappeared when he put the ring on his finger" (p. 211). Van Dam argues that it was unlikely that the girls were actually unable to come up with a sentence and, while they may have simply been not paying attention, he suggests that "the possibility that the 'English lesson' context blocks the activation of authentic instance of *disappear* that have been stored under different *ecological* conditions" (p. 211). In other words, the girls may have bumped up against a boundary of their contrived English lesson world that denied them access to their real-world interests. The teacher, it seems, was not operating within that same boundary.

[3] According to van Dam (2003), "'Balings' is the name used in the Dutch translation of Tolkien's 'The Lord of the Rings' by Max Schuchardt" (p. 219).

The preceding section has considered projections beyond the boundaries of the FL classroom. The section that follows considers what is adopted for use within those boundaries, beginning with what does (or does not) become authentic.

Authenticity

The appropriation of real-life language for the purposes of the classroom is a complex topic, and one that van Lier (2011) notes as coming along with "roadblocks" along the FL-real world boundary. Specifically, he explains how language often

> gets separated into (1) that which is validated in school but largely useless outside and (2) interesting stuff that you hear outside the classroom but that is not considered legitimate inside the classroom. In the end, a student might well ask, which language is “real”? Why does language get stopped at the classroom-life frontier, both on the way in and on the way out? (pp. 35-6).

In this section I first outline the theory that I make use of in Chapters 5 and 6, which considers the authenticity of talk in the FL classroom. Second, I outline theory as it relates to the authenticity of objects, knowledge, and other language materials that are imported into the FL classroom to be claimed, appropriated, or otherwise handled, which are considered in Chapters 7 and 8.

Authenticity of Talk

The works of Bourdieu (1992) and Freire (1970) operate on the notion that communication between teacher and student is governed by a power differential. This well-established critical argument refers to classroom discourse in general: FL classroom talk becomes even more complex in that something inherently performative often arises

when students speak their FL in situations that don't necessitate it. The challenge of place dictates that the whole FL speaking endeavor is potentially a farce, as long as students remain in the classroom: They could much more easily be speaking in their native language, and participants must employ a certain suspension of belief in order to participate at all. The realness of communicative exchanges is questionable in that often FL classroom exchanges are there for language practice, rather than communicative purpose- a situation that contradicts the presupposition that language mediates thought, social organization, identity construction, and the like.

Erickson (2004) likens face-to-face talk to "climbing a tree that climbs you back at the same time" (p. 110). This discursive mutual adaptation, or negotiation, happens in virtually every interaction to various degrees. My argument is that negotiation is at the cornerstone of authentic talk, assuming that authentic talk serves immediately meaningful social reasons, rather than fulfills performative, preparatory, or rote nature of FL classroom discourse, disconnected from any immediately socially meaningful realm. The ways by which talk emerges (or fails to emerge) as authentic in the FL classroom is thus central to this project, as this line of inquiry relates to how FL participants create (or not) spaces in their immediate social situation, that aren't imagined, but are authentic in a here-and-now sense. I posit that authentic talk is thus talk in which participants are actively co-constructing a dialogue that all parties agree is socially relevant in their immediate present.

Authenticity of Language Stuff

Information about and variations of the Spanish language and Latin cultures, cultural artifacts, cultural texts, native speakers and their experiences, etc. are all examples of what I will broadly refer to as "language stuff" (and, sometimes “language goods,” if I’m emphasizing their value). In short, language stuff is everything and anything (or anyone) from the Spanish-speaking world beyond the FL setting that might be physically invited into the FL classroom, or otherwise conjured, referred to, or asked about.

Authentic materials have often been defined as linguistic and cultural artifacts created for the purposes of the target language community, rather than for students (see Kramsch, 1993). Kramsch and von Hoene (2001) critique the widespread quest for authentic language materials, arguing that once acquired for purposes of the FL classroom, “authenticity is more often than not generic, genuineness is standardized, even stereotyped, eventfulness is essentialized” (p. 295). Indeed, the notion that authentic materials are those that come out of the target language community is increasingly discredited, as the authenticity (and meaningfulness) of cultural artifacts is socially constructed and ecologically emergent. Van Lier (2011) explains that “just like beauty is supposed to be in the eye of the beholder, authenticity is in the eye (and ear and so on) of the learners and their teachers. It is no more and no less than a process of authentication” (p. 40). In other words, authenticity is ecologically groundless in that something cannot be inherently authentic, but must emerge as such out of a meaningful, immediate process. While there are a number of respectable reasons why such materials may be adopted for

FL classroom use, it is necessary to bear in mind that their authenticity is dependent upon the social context out of which they came, and is thus not inherently part of them. Much like bringing a queen bee into a science classroom apart from her hive and worker bees defeats and undermines the point of what it means to be a queen bee, a Mexico City bus schedule is arguably altered in its social authenticity once it is imported into the language classroom as an artifact for language practice.

A certain confusion, or perhaps it is an unexamined assumption, causes "authentic" to often be conflated with "the way things are done in the real world". And, the way things are done in the real world are necessarily authentic much of the time, but the groundlessness of authenticity means that, as a characteristic, it cannot be relocated. Because the FL classroom exists apart from the real world target language communities (symbolically, if not geographically), there appears to be a certain futility to the endeavor of cultivating and appropriating any language stuff at all in order to maintain and make use of their initial authentic purposes.

Van Lier (2011) explains the FL classroom to be a place from which students may go out "rummaging around" for language stuff to bring back in (p. 39). Ahmed (2000) discusses modes by which people and things cross symbolic boundaries, noting specifically that meetings between people of different social realms aren't always face to face, nor do they "presuppose the category of the human person"; meetings can be symbolic, and can include the "coming together.... between reader and text," for example (p. 7). The dangers surrounding the importing, conjuring, and invitation of the language stuff of the real world lies with the possibility that they be reified and appropriated in a

way suited exclusively to the FL learning endeavor. Ahmed (2000) refers to this process of disconnecting things from their histories and authentic real world contexts as *fetishization*, a term fitting for how authenticity is so ubiquitously coveted in FL classrooms, often without question (see also von Hoene on "fetishizing the foreign," 1999, p. 28). The value of certain language goods over other (non-authentic) language goods necessarily connects to the construct of value, which is central to the final sections of this chapter.

Symbolic Capital in the Foreign Language Classroom

The final theoretical framework that I draw from is Bourdieu's (1977, 1992) notion of symbolic capital, which I used to explore the construct of value. He notes that, beyond material goods, social systems function such that some people have more power than others that cannot be quantified or transferred from one person to the next, but is still valuable in social ecosystems. The processes whereby some people hold more symbolic capital, or value, than others play out and are sustained in social interactions that negotiate global institutions and local ways of doing. Indeed, Erickson (2004) notes that Bourdieu's (1977) purpose in writing his *Outline of a Theory of Practice* was to demonstrate how it wasn't global norms alone that "govern" action (p. 119).

Bourdieu and Wacquant's (1992) notions of *field* and *habitus* are useful in illustrating how symbolic capital can be accrued in the classroom: The construct of *field* refers to the metaphorical game of life, in all its facets. The game of life is partitioned into various fields, one of which exists in the educational sphere as the educational game or, more specifically, the FL educational game. So, within the symbolic boundaries of

the FL classroom, the field can be thought of as the largely unspoken and presumed ways of doing: When to speak Spanish versus English, when to ask a peer for help versus when to know it's cheating, etc. *Habitus* is the term that refers to an individual's "sense of the game": Just like some students come into school in general with a stronger sense of the game than others, some FL students presumably come into the FL classroom with a stronger sense of that particular game than others (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 121). Students with a well-developed habitus have more symbolic capital than others, because not only do they know how to play, but are also perceived as knowing how to play, thus creating a self-perpetuating heightened social status. For the purposes of this chapter, I make use of the notions of field and habitus in order to clarify how symbolic capital emerges through tacit and mutually agreed upon indicators of value. However, it is symbolic capital, rather than field and habitus, which I will adopt in my analysis. The section that follows entertains how the FL classroom field is constrained by various authorities. As outlined above, textbooks are one authority in creating the imagined spaces relevant to the FL classroom; the section that follows, however, moves beyond imagined spaces to consider how various authorities shape the notion of value in the FL classroom.

Authority

Van Lier (2011) draws upon Whitehead's (1929) concept of inert knowledge in order to note that boundaries between the classroom and the so-called real world permit the existence of "knowledge that counts in the classroom but is irrelevant elsewhere" (van Lier, 2011, p. 34). The opposite is also true: Within the boundaries of the FL

classroom, the realness of language doesn't necessarily "count" as valuable in the way it may "count" outside (van Lier, 2011). Slang terms, for example, might be discouraged. For example, as a child spending time in Germany, van Lier learned that a lollipop could be referred to as a "*Dauerlutscher"* (or "lasting sucker"). His German as an FL teacher, however, discouraged that lexical item and instead insisted upon the term "*Luksussaugebonbonmitholzhandangriff*," which van Lier translates to a "luxury sucking candy with wooden handle" (p. 35). The authority of the FL teacher in these cases can be understood because her position as the teacher signals linguistic authority. As argued by Bourdieu (1992), those with the most authority in any given social context typically are speakers of the "legitimate" language, be that a linguistic code itself, or a variation therein (p. 69). While Bourdieu's argument is predominantly focused on how authority (and wealth) is accumulated by means of language, he also points out that those with an institutionally awarded authoritative role may, indeed, determine that which constitutes "legitimate" in their context (see also Austin, 1962). Bourdieu (1992) explains this process by using an economics metaphor, which is largely the foundation for his notion of symbolic capital:

> It is the structure of the field itself which governs expression by governing both access to expression and the form of expression…. This structural censorship [functions] as a market on which the prices of different kinds of expression are formed (p. 138).

While what becomes valuable is indeed a point of interest, it is an assumption of mine entering into analysis that the teacher wields much power in constituting the local

field of the classroom, particularly in terms of what counts as acceptable, valuable, and legitimate. While much of what contributes to student success in classroom may be largely symbolic and hard to identify due to the hegemonic nature of certain social privileges, one concrete way to conceive of an in-class market is to consider what assessment looks like, and what "counts" within the field of FL language assessment.

Van Lier (2011) critiques student and teacher strong orientation to assessment, although he concedes that, without an external authority that represents the demands of the real world in a way accessible to classrooms, it is only understandable that classroom participants become fixated on a visible, present authority, albeit a false one, within their bounded space. For FL spaces, van Lier explains that this means that various uses of real-world language may or may not be acceptable within a classroom that is guided toward "standard" forms of the target language, or more generalized forms, that will be understood across various language contexts. Thus internal sources of authority, oftentimes the teacher, determine what counts as valuable (or, worth academic points, in the FL classroom); and similar to how authenticity cannot travel with a restaurant menu or bus map from Mexico City into a foreign language classroom, the value of language acts is highly dependent on the FL educational environment that brings them about.

Given the assumption that the teacher in the FL classroom is a grand player in the construction of value within the FL boundary, she might also be thought to generate opportunities for students to accrue symbolic capital of the academic sort. For instance, a teacher generates quizzes, tests, competitions, and other opportunities for students to formally earn points that actually can be quantified. The ways by which these points are

awarded, negotiated for, and earned, however, are interwoven with institutional and individual preconceptions of value on both the students' and teacher's part. For instance, in his case study that draws both from Marx and Bourdieu, Foley (2010) found students to participate in what he refers to as "making-out games," or the academic games they played that permitted them to do the least amount of work for the highest academic payoff; in this case study, the teachers were presumably manufacturing the field in which students accrued capital, and the students made use of that field in the way best suited to their academic needs.

In the arena of FL education, Norton (2001) notes that student investment in their second language is often based on an understanding that language proficiency comes along with both symbolic and material resources beyond the field of the classroom. Norton's work can easily be understood through social capital, as her work has largely been with immigrants who are learning English, the language of their new communities; in the case of FL in the United States, English speaking monolingual students don't necessarily have an immediate understanding of the social and material pay-offs that learning Spanish may offer. If they do, they may be imagined, future benefits that don't relate to their immediate lives. Indeed, the privileged position of students who already speak the language of academic and economic power is essentially an indicator of symbolic capital to begin with, in the larger national and international contexts. Then, the most immediate climb for social and academic power may actually take place within the arena of the FL classroom itself, identifiable in the ways by which students position themselves to the academic material. Because this project is based in large part in

exploring the ways that authenticity is constructed in a contrived environment, analysis will specifically consider the ways by which value is (or is not) attributed to real-world language stuff. The next section entertains a brief critical discussion that harkens back to the ways by which authenticity dissolves when it is imported into the classroom; specifically, it entertains the ways in which authenticity and value may relate to one another when students claim proximity to imagined and unimagined real world Spanish.

Social Proximity, Authenticity, and Symbolic Capital

Ahmed (2000) considers the ways by which the presence and existence of strangers permit conceptions of self and community to emerge (see also Hutchinson, 2004; Kramsch, 2009, Chapter 4; Kristeva, 1991, 1993; von Hoene 1995, 1999). The dialectical relationship between self and other is readily identifiable in the FL classroom context: Without the native-speaking other (or, more generally, the very existence of the target language), the FL classroom ceases to have purpose and, indeed, would cease to exist (a clear parallel to the emergence of *nation*). The dependence of the FL environment on the real-world version of the target language is thus tacitly accepted by its participants, and in-class references to the real world work to pull things across the symbolic boundaries of the FL classroom, a process which shapes the FL classroom itself but also complicates the authenticity of that which transcends the classroom boundaries. Ahmed (2000) calls for a critical examination of the various "modes of proximity" we employ in connecting with the strange, authentic world beyond whatever boundaries we've constructed around ourselves (p. 13).

Proximity to commodities (such as language stuff) is one way by which we attempt to forge connections with the worlds beyond our reach (Ahmed, 2000). Importing language goods into an FL classroom not only boosts local individual symbolic power but also likely disconnects those goods from their histories. This process of *commodity fetishization* is described by Ahmed:

> First, the object comes to be valued (is 'enigmatic') only through a prior act of detachment from the social relationships of labour and production that produced it. Second, the object is invested with meaning by being associated with the figure of the stranger: indeed, the object becomes the stranger; it is consumed as that which contains the 'truth' of the strange or exotic. The fetishism of the commodity becomes displaced onto the fetishism of cultural difference: we value the lost object by assuming *it contains difference in its own form* (pp. 114-5).

In other words, the fetishization of language stuff involves various fracturing processes that divorce it from the real world, while it continues to be coveted as being from the real world.

While language stuff may be brought into the FL classroom, students may also work at projecting themselves beyond the FL boundary into the world in which the FL is spoken. Ahmed explains that the experience of "becoming other" is "a fantasy that is increasingly offered to the Western subject" (p. 119). In other words, establishing credibility as someone who has had contact with the real Spanish-speaking world is coveted. Ahmed points out, though, that this process of getting closer is not interchangeable with actually becoming: The Western subject often retains the privilege

to disavow his connection and affiliation with the other if need be- he is able "*to become without becoming"* (Ahmed, 2000, p. 128, emphasis in original). In the case of the present study, given the information that my student participants are predominantly monolingual speakers of English learning a subaltern language, I consider how they negotiate their proximity (or distance) from both imagined and non-imagined Spanish-speaking worlds, and for what academic and social pay-offs.

In this section, I have introduced symbolic capital, and the concepts of *field* and *habitus*. I have explained how authority plays an important role in constructing value in the FL classroom, and have characterized negotiation of social proximity as an important player at intersection of value and authenticity.

This chapter, as a whole, has focused on how participants at the site of an FL classroom might interact with their wider world. This was done first by considering how both investment and FL texts project language learners into imagined scenarios. Second, this was done by considering how language and language stuff from the real world are made to transcend the FL classroom boundaries and are appropriated for local purposes, such as accruing symbolic capital and establishing social proximity. This concludes the literature and framework portion of the dissertation. The next chapter outlines methodology.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

In Chapters 2 and 3, I attempted to demonstrate how the Spanish FL classroom is nestled in a series of complex, messy sociopolitical and sociolinguistic layers that affect the constructs of authenticity and value as they come forth within the classroom. The current chapter is divided into two sections. The first half of the chapter is theoretical: I will first briefly outline some general assumptions of ecological inquiry, which are predicated on the complexity and messiness mentioned above. Next, I will explore the connections between ecological inquiry and the tradition of discourse analysis. Finally, I will explain the tradition of critical discourse analysis. The second half of the chapter outlines data collection and data analysis methods for the present study.

Ecological Inquiry

An ecological approach to social phenomena necessarily has to take into account that whatever is being studied stretches beyond what can be observed in any isolated moment. In explaining states of organisms, Damasio (1994) offers a helpful example of what it would look like to freeze the activities of an airport for a moment: The people arriving, departing, checking-in, going through security, buying coffee, edging into line in front of strangers would together comprise a momentary state of the ecological social organism of the airport (p. 87). For the purposes of, say, an airport ethnography, that frame alone is potentially quite telling of the things that might be happening, but complete understanding of the snapshot is also highly dependent on the moments just

before, and just after; on the intentions, relationships and expectations of the people on the scene, and so on. In other words, seeing what one sees in that instant is nothing without some conception of what the social organism looks like when it is in its natural state of operation. Language behavior in particular, Leather & van Dam (2003) argue, "always involves more than can be captured in any single frame or script" (p. 13). Larson-Freeman (2002) offers an ecological metaphor for understanding the potential pitfalls on inquiry that focuses on an unnaturally bounded space, explaining that SLA researchers can't come to understand the process of cognitive language acquisition before turning to the social aspects of SLA any more than they "can understand the whole of an organism by understanding its circulatory system" (pp. 40-1). In an earlier piece, Larson Freeman (1997) says it's actually "self-defeating" to isolate and analyze the FL classroom (p. 159). In other words, an ecological approach to inquiry is necessarily inclusive.

Of course, this poses a number of challenges in that it is an empirical necessity to create boundaries around one's work. For the purposes of this project, I have determined it most trustworthy to actually focus on the boundaries my *participants* make around their social spaces: My own empirical boundaries have been largely determined by the boundary-making processes in my research setting. Thus, as a researcher I have traced the boundary-making processes of my participants through relevant sociopolitical and sociolinguistic layers, both in time (the moments before and after) and space (inside and outside the classroom). This makes for a rather messy research workplace, but ecology (including social ecology) is "a complex and messy field of study about a complex and

messy reality" (van Lier, 2002, p. 144). In other words, as a researcher I could trade in trustworthiness for a feeling of tidiness, but, as mentioned above, that would almost certainly be self-defeating.

The importance of embracing the constant change that permits the adaptation and survival of social phenomena relates directly to the trustworthiness of the inquiry itself, in that to eliminate the messiness of the constant change is to alter (or stall) the phenomenon in question. Leather and van Lier (2003) offer a concise explanation of what they call "ecological validity":

> Language acquisition can to only a limited extent be studied under experimental conditions. For one thing, experiments constitute their own contexts, since they 'constitute ill-specified new situations' (Lave, 1997) relating to previous situations in ways that are difficult for either the subject or the experimenter to know. More generally, performing tasks and solving problems in laboratory or purportedly 'controlled' settings does not straightforwardly predict how people will perform in the 'fuzzy, often incomplete, unfolding… tasks' of everyday life (Cole et al., 1978). It is therefore not clear that, even in principle, the first two of Bronfenbrenner's (1997; 1979) three conditions for ecological validity in psychological research could be met: (1) an experiment must maintain the integrity of the real-life situations it is designed to investigate; (2) an experiment must be faithful to the larger social and cultural contexts from which the subjects come; (3) the analysis of the experimental results must be consistent with the *participants'* definition of the situation. (pp. 23-4).

In the second half of this chapter, I will further treat the topic of trustworthiness as it relates to my specific data collection and analysis methods. The section that follows outlines the connection between ecology and discourse, ultimately making a case for discourse analysis as a compatible method for ecologically-oriented inquiry.

Ecology and Discourse Analysis

Frederick Erickson (2004), a well known discourse analyst with ecological inclinations describes the phenomenon of discursive negotiation in ecological terms: "...as we react in our speaking to the reactions of our listeners, they are also reacting to us. Thus speaking and listening are reflexively related in an ecology of mutual influence" (p. 4). Erickson's (2004) thesis is essentially that the relationship between the local and global manifestations of talk are mediated by agentive speakers who, in each moment of interaction, might conform to the global, institutional ways of interacting or who might diverge from such discourses in on-the-ground interaction. The global ways of doing thus afford spaces for gradual change, as promoted by new local ways of doing and vice versa; In other words, they co-adjust by means of mutual adaptation. Of course, any specific interaction is situated within (and, in fact, emergent of) a rich historical context: "Economy, history, and the distribution of power within society provide what we do in face-to-face interaction with sets of constraints and enablements which we encounter as structures of local affordance" (Erickson, 2004, p. 16). This interplay between global and local discourses parallels the negotiation between any two interlocutors in any given interaction. There is constant shifting occurring to ensure the best mutual good fit.

In his widely cited book on discourse analysis, James Paul Gee (1999) explains how language scaffolds human social performance in that it not only structures, but re-creates human enactments of everyday social constructs such as *family* or *school* (see also Cazden, 2001). Gee (1999) refers to the characteristic of language as simultaneously constituting and reflecting social context as *reflexivity*. The reciprocal nature of language coming forth through context and vice versa is, of course, an example of emergence. Further, since this process is, in each moment of interaction, new, there is also constant work between interlocutors to negotiate a mutual good fit, not only between their own local individual utterances, but between the discursive arch of their interaction and the global social expectations of the context that they are acting in and upon.

An additional ecological requirement (one not overlooked by discourse analysts) is that all on-the-ground discourse is situated in a specific time and place. Maturana and Varela (1987), among the first scholars to apply an ecological framework to human cognition, explain this as a necessity to understanding how talk works:

> All the interactions that independently specify the reference background of each interlocutor constitute the context in which a given linguistic interaction takes place. Every linguistic interaction is thus necessarily context-dependent, and this dependency is strictly deterministic for both orienter and orientee, notwithstanding the different backgrounds of the two processes. It is only for the observer that there is any ambiguity in a linguistic interaction that he observes; this is because he has no access to the context in which it occurs. (p. 33)

Language, in other words, must be understood as an ecological phenomenon that inevitably spans beyond each instant of talk. To freeze-frame a conversation and consider an utterance out of spatial, historical, or otherwise temporal sequence is to strip it of what makes it *discourse.* These assumptions about language are shared by language ecologists (Haugen, 1972; Hornberger, 2002; Hornberger & Hult, 2008; Hult, 2010; Leather & van Dam, 2003) and discourse analysts (Erickson, 2004; Blommaert 2005, 2007; Scollon & Scollon, 2003; van Dam, 2003; van Lier, 2002) alike, and serve as a suitable premise upon which an ecological approach to discourse analysis (DA) may be conceived. Indeed, it even fills a gap, as ecology is a conceptual orientation to understanding social phenomena, and in and of itself does not supply a method (Hult 2010). Hult (2010) and van Lier (2002) both make the case for DA as a method by which ecological phenomena may come to be understood, the latter referring to DA as a "relative of" ecology (p. 144).

In an article making the case for DA in considering language planning and policy as an ecological phenomenon, Hult (2010) considers the local/global distinction so often made in the tradition of DA. While he accepts these categories as a suitable framework from which to begin to explore discourse, he argues that ultimately the distinction between global and local are abstractions that cannot be tidily teased apart: "Linguistic ecosystems, like biological ones," he explains, "do not always have sharp boundaries" (p. 13). Hult thus emphasizes the importance that the local and global be understood as happening on the "same plane of existence" as one another in every given moment of on-the-ground interaction. (p. 18; see also Blommaert, 2007, p. 5).

Van Lier (2011) notes that even seemingly simple and intuitive global categories such as *teacher* and *student* may affect a researcher's understanding of what is happening in a given local sequence. Similarly, Leather and van Dam (2003) introduce their edited volume titled *Ecology of Language Acquisition* with a more concrete but similar challenge to "look beyond dichotomies like *institutional* vs. *conversational* or ready-made analytic categories like *question-answer pair*," arguing that these categories can restrict researcher awareness of what is actually happening for interlocutor insiders during interaction (p. 22). Van Dam's (2003) study in the same volume serves as a model for ecologically-driven DA: The in-class participation and an ongoing diary study of two Dutch teenaged girls who were learning English gives a holistic view of the ways by which the students make use of their FL both inside and outside of the formal classroom setting. By focusing on the ways by which his participants pull English beyond the boundaries of their formal learning environment, van Dam was able to track how the language emerges as a real tool, with which the girls experiment and play for various purposes in various settings. Van Dam emphasizes the importance of "the half-off-record communications that take place in the nooks and crannies of institutional practices," arguing that traditional research designs may set researchers up to miss key interactions that emerge in a time or space beyond a pre-specified scope of analysis that partitions otherwise fluid realms of social life (p. 203). Erickson (2004) echoes this point in arguing for an approach to discourse that is highly locally attuned, noting that focusing only on the obvious institutionalized language structures would likely cause a researcher to miss speakers' "mutterings, snickerings, and bricolage moves through which they

escaped panoptical surveillance. We would miss the 'wiggle room' they constructed in their intuitively adept practicings as local social actors" (p. 196; see also Garfinkel, 1967). The next section concludes the theoretical portion of this chapter, and serves to explain critical discourse analysis, a tradition from which I adopt a small but important number of assumptions for my analysis.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Gee's (1999) conception of discourse emphasizes that speaking is, by definition, perspective-taking: Grammar does not permit us to say things neutrally. While this premise resonates powerfully with scholars from a number of traditions (see Freire, 1998, p. 50; Ochs, 1996; Sapir, 1949), I focus here on the ways discourse analysts treat this presumed truth. DA operates as a worthwhile method of social analysis largely because talk is assumed to be highly reflective of speakers' perceptions of their worlds (Erickson, 2004). Work specifically in *critical* DA presumes the interconnectedness of language and society, particularly insofar as how power structures are maintained and re-created through talk (Blommeart, 2005; Fairclough 2001a, 2001b; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Riggins, 1997; Wodak, 2001).

While critical DA is sometimes critiqued for operating with presupposed bias (see Blommaert, 2005), my approach is more akin to grounded theory (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) or ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967) in that is highly focused on locally constructed social realities and, thus not based on many, if any, predetermined categories or conceptions of ways things are. This resonates with the calls above from ecology theorists to maintain freedom from globally-conceived-of categories, at least initially.

While my analysis itself isn't exclusively critical, in that I'm not seeking to learn about societal hegemonies perpetuated through talk, the premise of the study itself certainly has a critical flair in that I'm preoccupied with social inequalities as perpetuated through the endeavor of FL education. Then, some information on how critical discourse analysts approach talk is relevant to how I conduct my analysis.

I find Blommeart's (2005) position on what critical DA ought to accomplish particularly helpful:

> Critical discourse analysis should not be a discourse analysis that reacts against power *alone*. It is a commonplace to equate 'critical approaches' with 'approaches that criticize power'…. It should be an analysis of power *effects*, of the outcome of power, of what power *does* to people, groups, and societies and of *how* this impact comes about" (pp. 1-2, italics in original).

One of the ways by which power effects can be considered is through the ways they bubble up onto the discursive stage in local interaction. Within this local interaction, some categories put forth by Fairclough (1995, pp. 106-109) become helpful, not as a frame for analysis, but to help conceptualize the ways that interlocutors offer hints about their realities through their talk. Specifically, Fairclough distinguishes between four types of discursive information: *Foregrounded* information includes content that is conversationally emphasized or otherwise highlighted. *Backgrounded* information includes content that is explicitly mentioned or established, but not emphasized as of great import. *Presupposed* information refers to those assumptions and understandings that are tacit, and are thus especially interesting indicators of what shared local attitudes

may be. Finally, *absent* information refers to ideas that could feasibly be relevant to a topic, but that go entirely unmentioned. The ways by which information is presented is not only telling of participant understandings of the topic of talk, but is also rich with information about their social positioning to the topic: What types of social distance or social power are presumed? Overtly established? Who or what is missing from the conversation? Who gets to say what when, and who stays silent? Following Riggins (1997), one can also consider use of inclusive and exclusive pronouns (e.g. us, them) and possessives (e.g. our, their) to discover when, where, why, and how participants draw boundaries between themselves and others (p. 8). These are questions to prompt critical consideration of how classroom participants use discourse to display information about their perceived realities.

In the first portion of this chapter, I have explained ecological inquiry, and have established a connection between DA and ecology theory. Additionally, I have briefly explained some of my locally-inclined, grounded approaches to DA while outlining and embracing some the more globally-inclined tradition of critical DA. In the second half of this chapter, I outline my methodologies for data collection and data analysis.

Data Collection

I was first present in Classroom 204 during October of the academic year. At this time, I wasn't officially collecting data, but was considering the classroom as the site for my research. While data collection didn't start until January of that year, the students had grown accustomed to my occasional presence in their classroom over the course of the three previous months. Once I began collecting data in January, I attended class for four

out of the five sessions per week, occasionally leaving my audio-recorder with Ms. Mikes on the day I missed so that she could record in my absence. I collected data through the end of the school year, in early May.

Setting

This study focuses on an eighth grade Spanish FL classroom in a city in Texas. I refer to the classroom as *Classroom 204*, and the private middle school in which it was located as *First Street Middle School.* First Street Middle School divided its beginning Spanish curriculum between two academic years, beginning in the seventh grade. During the majority of my observations, Classroom 204 was in its final five months of this two-year arch. First Street Middle School was nestled in a quiet neighborhood of the city, not far from downtown, and about 140 seventh and eighth grade students attended school there daily. Tuition was roughly twenty thousand dollars annually, and was among the more expensive in the region. The school did have a financial assistance program utilized by more than 15% of the student body, which accounted for a generous amount of the school's annual budget.

Classroom 204 was decorated with various Spanish-language posters and other relevant visuals (such as an upside-down map tacked up in the back of the classroom). Windows ran along one wall, and under them were cabinets full of different objects for various language-learning activities (e.g. flashcards, props for skits, etc.). Student desks were shaped in a U, facing the white board at the front of the class, which was next to the teacher's desk. The teacher, whom I'll refer to as Ms. Mikes, typically taught either from the white board, or sitting or standing within the center of the U. Her classroom was

quite student-centered, so she also spent much time checking in on students working in groups or as individuals, and inviting them to take center-stage in the middle of the U for various reasons.

Participants

The class, which met daily for roughly an hour, was comprised of seven students: Five girls and two boys. While all seven students might be referred to as linguistically and culturally of the U.S. "mainstream," and while all (from what I could ascertain) enjoyed European-Caucasion privilege, two students claimed additional cultural identities: Mary's family was Jewish, and Kelsey's was middle eastern. More information about each participant follows.

Ms. Mikes.

Ms. Mikes was a white woman in her early forties, with a doctorate in Spanish. At the time of the study, she was relatively new to the school, but had extensive Spanish teaching experience elsewhere. A native speaker of English, she learned Spanish throughout high school and college, and had numerous living and travel experiences in Latin America and Spain. Her teaching style was largely a blend of traditional grammar lessons and communication-oriented games and activities, and she was well informed in the topics of SLA and FL teaching methodology. Overall, she struck me as highly innovative, organized, and enthusiastic.

Erica.

Erica is the classroom participant who probably is least involved in my data analysis. A bit shorter than most of her peers and blonde, she was relatively quiet, but

not shy. She was well liked and very socially engaged, but didn't tend to initiate or drive interactions during Spanish class. She was a competent student though, with a good sense of humor and a high engagement level most of the time.

Quinn.

Quinn, like Erica, was well liked, but didn't tend to initiate Spanish-related interactions. Although she had a shy air about her, this young teenager advocated for herself on a regular basis, particularly relating to academic topics. Nonetheless, she had less confidence in her Spanish, struggling with basic grammar and vocabulary that some of her peers had mastered. She would occasionally be caught reading during Spanish class, and was a fanatic of *The Hunger Games* books (Collins, 2008) and movie- a topic which surfaces in Chapter 6.

Mary.

Mary had a strong Jewish-American identity, and had a basic background in Hebrew. She was socially well integrated into the class for the most part, but had to work harder at social acceptance in the middle school in general than did many of her peers. Mary was assertive, inquisitive, good-natured, and quite competitive.

Cassandra.

Cassandra had a strong background in Spanish, having started it in the first grade. Although she wasn't the only one in the class with this background, her Spanish competence, particularly with grammar and listening comprehension, was quite strong. She was well liked socially, and seemed to be the student to whom the other girls in the

class most often gravitated. She was kind, funny, humble, and willing to help peers with their Spanish.

Kelsey.

Kelsey was of middle-eastern heritage, and she had very basic awareness of the two middle-eastern languages her parents spoke. She was highly competitive, her Spanish proficiency rivaled only by Cassandra. Kelsey was the most well travelled in the class and thus had used Spanish abroad in a number of contexts. She had an acute conceptual awareness regarding avoiding direct translation from English.

Henry.

Henry often established himself as the comical center of attention. His sense of humor was advanced, as was his English vocabulary. He was well liked, and able to laugh at himself. He had actually had Ms. Mikes as a teacher when he was younger. His organizational skills were notoriously lacking, and his Spanish was pretty consistent, coming with an occasional impressive grammatical insight.

Ricky.

Ricky had also had Ms. Mikes previously, and was Henry's sidekick. The only two boys, their banter and good-natured teasing would often entertain their peers during lulls in the class. Ricky, a high-spirited, earnest thirteen-year old, was consistently energetic, cheerful, and polite. He made a concerted effort with his work, and generally did quite well. On occasion, his energy level would be extremely high, but he would be unable to maintain focus, which exasperated both Ms. Mikes and some of his peers.

Data Sources

I audio-recorded on most days that I was present. The first couple of days when I was present in an official capacity, I chose not to audio-record, as I wanted to gradually become a more stable fixture of the classroom without overwhelming the students; further, at that juncture I was waiting on a couple of pending informed consent forms, and was temporarily omitting some of the students from data collection. I also chose not to record on a day when students were performing songs for the class, as I didn't want to add to their performance anxiety. Also, when students were taking a test or quiz, I generally turned my recorder off once they had become silent. Typically, when I was recording, I placed the audio recorder at a relatively central location in class. When students were working in groups, I would sometimes move it closer to one group, particularly if it had originally been positioned so that it would pick up multiple conversations at once. In total, I collected approximately 40 class sessions of audio, totaling approximately 30 hours.

In addition to audio recording, I took copious amounts of field notes during each class. I generally sat on one of two parallel sides of the U where students didn't tend to sit (closest to the board). Sometimes I would be next to Ricky, and other times next to Cassandra. Because I was physically very much part of the class, I chose to take notes using only pen and paper because those were the same tools students were most often using. I generally jotted down information that I wouldn't be able to remember based on the audio alone, including participants' physical locations and silent communication, things written on the board, the general tone or feeling of interactions (Were students confused? Was Ms. Mikes amused or was she upset?), and anything that I noted as

potentially interesting that I was concerned the audio-recorder might not catch (such as Ricky and Henry's muffled whispers to one another during a lesson). My field notes weren't limited to these categories; when in doubt, I wrote it down.

After each class session, I immediately listened to my audio recordings for the day while referring to my hand-written field notes in order to type up a narrative-form of what happened in Classroom 204. My in-class field notes were taken quickly and efficiently, so consistently writing long-form field notes ensured that, upon analysis, I would not have to guess at what my quick jottings-down meant.

To supplement the field notes and audio recordings of class sessions, I collected artifacts from Classroom 204. Mainly, these were handouts from Ms. Mikes (e.g. worksheets, supplemental notes, explanations of class projects, etc.), work completed by students (e.g. homework, projects, quizzes, etc.) and other curricular and institutional materials (e.g. textbook pages and permission slips for field trips). When there was an extra copy of something, I took a hard copy; when it was a students' original work, I scanned it quickly into my laptop at the beginning or end of class, using a hand-held scanner. As with the field notes, when in doubt, I collected these artifacts.

My final data source is participant interviews. I conducted both formal and informal interviews both with Ms. Mikes and with the seven students. As the class was so small, I came to know each student relatively well. We typically would greet one another at the start of class, and say goodbye at its end. Because of these relationships, and because of Ms. Mikes' willingness and the students' ability to stay relatively focused, I sometimes would ask them easy-to-answer questions at appropriate points during the

period (e.g. When was that homework assigned? Was Quinn absent yesterday?). Similarly, I would occasionally clarify something with Ms. Mikes before or after class, or via email.

Formal interviews with Ms. Mikes took place three times over the course of the spring lasting from about twenty to forty-five minutes each. Because she was so willing to think aloud about her practice in these interviews, I generally didn't prepare a strict set of questions, but instead began each discussion by asking about something relevant to my study that I had witnessed in class (e.g. I noticed Quinn often makes up words in Spanish). During these interviews, I engaged in satisfying conversation with Ms. Mikes about FL pedagogy in general. From this, I learned a lot about her understanding of her job and her practice, which allowed me to understand Classroom 204.

I interviewed each student either two or three times towards the end of the spring: Each first student interview was very brief (5-10 minutes), and done in pairs. The second interviews were longer (20 minutes) and also done in pairs; the goal was to interview each student at least twice, and some students were interviewed three times total. While the first interview was so short purely for logistical and scheduling reasons, I think it functioned to give the students a good idea of what the interview would entail: It was casual, friendly, and involved no questions they couldn't answer. They, after all, were the experts.

I chose to have the students interview both times in pairs for two main reasons. Firstly, interviewing students together permitted me to conduct longer interviews than I would have been able to otherwise; thankfully, Ms. Mikes was highly flexible with me

taking two students at a time out of class for twenty minutes. Secondly, the rapport between the students in the class was notable, and I thought that interviewing in pairs would ease any misgivings or shyness that might come up, and that I was likely to get more information from two students about an experience they shared than from a single student (see Silverman, 1997, pp. 5-6 on telling news and pp.114-20 on storytelling).

I determined most of my interview questions based on my field notes. In fact, while I was typing up my field notes, I would often write down specific questions that occurred to me to follow up on with a particular participant, whether it be a simple clarification or a request for student opinion, perspective, etc. Further, in order to scaffold my trustworthiness, I used interviews as an opportunity to check with participants about my perception of classroom happenings. Having multiple participants weigh-in in separate interviews with their interpretations of what I thought to be a notable event or classroom happening served not only to clarify my understanding of aspects of Classroom 204, but to help me gauge the general accuracy of my quest to understand the ways of Classroom 204 from an insider perspective. Appendix I includes a sample of the questions I had prepared in advance of student interviews.

Interviews, both informal and formal, are what Marton (1981) refers to as second-order data, or data that illustrates not necessarily what people do (as captured by first order data such as audio-recordings) but their perception of what they do. This use of both first- and second-order data sources also contributes to my overall trustworthiness in that my interpretation of the first-order data doesn't replace the participants' interpretations thereof.

Data Analysis

This section outlines my data analysis steps chronologically.

Adjusting My Research Questions

The whole organism of Classroom 204 in operation was far too complex for me to have come to understood all aspects of it thoroughly, and while my data collection was relatively indiscriminate, my analysis focused on the aspects of Classroom 204 that appeared related to the challenge of authenticity, as described in Chapter 1 and to the construct of boundary, as described in Chapter 2. In fact, my initial guiding research questions were quite concrete:

How do FL participants talk about Spanish?

How do FL participants talk about native speakers of Spanish who aren't there?

How do FL participants appropriate real world language and culture for classroom use?

Initially approaching my data with these questions in mind gave me enough structure and insight into the happenings of Classroom 204 to come up with my final research questions about the challenge of authenticity, and the relationship between value and authenticity, which permitted me a robust, intimate analysis of the world of Classroom 204, informed by the local happenings I observed and talked with participants about.

The section that follows offers more details about my methods of analysis.

Initial Analytic Steps

My analysis started by dividing my field notes into two-week chunks of field notes, and coding them individually, before looking across the entire four month span of

my data. Doing this permitted me to see which themes I could actually track across my data set, versus those that may have been interesting but overall relatively fleeting. Further, starting with field notes encouraged me to jump into the data through my source which best preserved the whole, intact experience of each day in Classroom 204.

While much of my fine-tuned discourse analysis is based on transcripts, I did not move to transcript analysis until I had a working understanding about what themes the field notes pointed me to, things that I had noticed both during the two-week-chunk analyses and during the field note taking itself. There was, of course, some back and forth in this process: Certain realizations in my discourse analysis would send me back to my field notes with new understandings. While most of my analysis involved a back-and-forth between field notes and transcripts, interviews and artifacts served as additional data to affirm, negate or otherwise influence my understandings.

As noted by Ochs (1979) the very process of transcription is analytic in nature and I thus arguably began to employ DA upon transcription. The first step of transcription was determining what to transcribe, which I did while writing up each day's field notes. While listening to the day's audio recording, and considering it in conjunction with my field notes, I marked minutes of class time that appeared relevant to boundaries, authenticity, and value. While there were no comprehensive criteria for this other than a "when in doubt, transcribe" approach, some basic guidelines were:

Boundaries.

Any acknowledgement that there existed a Spanish-speaking world beyond Classroom 204. Any partitioning of time/space within Classroom 204 or between

Classroom 204 and the rest of the world. Any other distinction between groups of people or ways of using of Spanish. Any identifiable "clash" in participant understandings about what is happening at any given moment, particularly as it relates to the challenge of authenticity.

Authenticity.

Any talk (or other manifestation of interest) about the way things are done in the real world. Any distinction made between Spanish-for-students and the Spanish of the real world. Any appropriation of real-world Spanish or Spanish language goods by members of Classroom 204. Any ways by which Spanish becomes an authentic (or ritualized, or decidedly inauthentic) way of communicating in Classroom 204, if even for a moment.

Value.

Any indication that there is value (social, monetary, academic, etc.) in acquiring or establishing some type of relationship with any formal or informal component of the Spanish learning process.

Some class sessions were rich with talk that related to these topics, and others weren't. A class session with nothing at all to transcribe was uncommon. On average, I transcribed between two and four conversational sequences per class session, ranging in length from roughly 30 seconds to ten minutes. While transcribing I occasionally referred to my field notes to ensure that I knew who was speaking when. I began

transcriptions just before the sequence of talk of interest begins, and ended them just after it finished.

Coding My Field Notes and Transcripts

Based on my initial analysis with my field notes, and the process of transcribing, I had a working idea of what themes were emerging as relevant. For instance, some prominent themes based on my initial field notes analysis were: authority, *Mock Spanish* (Hill, 2008), uses of English vs. Spanish, real-world experience, and social proximity. Once a specific theme emerged as salient, I reviewed the data that I had marked as relating to that theme, and rethought the theme considering various ways of interpreting the data.

For instance, it was obvious from my first week of observation that some students used what Hill (2008) refers to as *Mock Spanish*. I coded instances of language use that embodied Hill's explanation of Mock Spanish, such as the student I call Henry announcing that he was "finosho" to say "finished." Once I began coding Mock Spanish, however, I realized this category wasn't as clear-cut as it had originally appeared: Cassandra exclaimed "OMG," pronouncing each of the letters in Spanish, with an amused grin on her face that told me she was more than aware that this painfully direct translation of the "Oh my God" shorthand does not work. The awareness that I sensed in Cassandra and in other students pertaining to their uses of Mock Spanish (and the various degrees and manifestations of it) ultimately caused me to include what I coded as un-Mock Spanish, or student uses of Spanish in which they second-guess, or somehow note,

their instincts to use their English language proficiency to support their Spanish. This will be more thoroughly explained in Chapter 5.

DA allowed for a high level of nuance in this process, as each theme came along with a set of transcripts I had noted as relevant to, or somehow demonstrating that theme as it manifested itself in Classroom 204. While my transcripts ranged from 20 lines (or turns) to hundreds, as an analyst, I tended to focus on the shorter snippets of talk while keeping in mind the discursive whole. For example, a student's use of Mock Spanish in one line, what prompted it in the prior conversational turn, and how it was responded to in the subsequent turns is a manageable amount of discourse to fully analyze in all of its facets. Considering discursive patterns across similar snippets of talk from over the time frame from which the data were collected permitted me to start hypothesizing about how Mock Spanish worked in Classroom 204, and returning to field notes and checking in with students during interviews contributed to the ultimate analysis. This process is essentially how all of my findings developed, and in Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8 I share these findings and include discourse data and explanations of my analysis in order to explain them. If the reader is interested in reviewing transcripts in their entirety, Appendix II includes a transcript titled "The Hunger Games," various excerpts of which are analyzed in Chapter 6; and Appendix III includes a transcript titled "The Rosetta Stone Discussion," which is treated in Chapter 7.

Chapter 5 is the first of four findings chapters. It will introduce some ways by which the participants in Classroom 204 created their FL space through talk. It begins by considering the role of ritualized exchanges in the classroom. Next, uses of English and

Spanish are discussed, with close attention paid to how each language is employed for socially immediate purposes. Finally, appropriations of Spanish that are unique to Classroom 204 are examined in light of how they allow the site to emerge as a cohesive speech community.

CHAPTER 5

BRINGING FORTH SPACES WITH TALK

As established in Chapters 2 and 3, symbolic boundaries allow for communities and other social spaces to emerge as cohesive in the minds of the belonging social actors. While the physical boundaries of the Classroom 204 are quite evident, the challenge of authenticity necessitates that these aren't the only boundaries that dictate what exists inside or outside the classroom. This chapter focuses on types of spaces and boundaries that are created by talk in Classroom 204, and how participants negotiate and inhabit those spaces.

Doing Starting: Ritualized Talk

One morning in February, just before the start of class, Quinn and Cassandra were having an intense conversation with Ms. Mikes about the dress code. It turns out, Ms. Mikes had just "dress coded" Quinn because of skirt length, and the girls were indignant about some of the dress-coding politics. When the passing period ended, Ms. Mikes transitioned: "Ok, well, Buenos días," she started, but interrupted herself to promise that that she would pay closer attention to the seventh graders' dress which, was one of Cassandra's central concerns. This conversation continued for another minute before Ms. Mikes restarted the class:

Line[4]	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Ms. Mikes	Ok, buenas ta- Buenos días- did we already do that? Buenos días.	Okay, good aftern- good morning- de we already do that? Good morning.
2	Students	Buenos días	Good morning.

[4] Transcription conventions can be found in Appendix IV.

3	Ms. Mikes	¿Cómo están?	How are you?
4	Students	Muy bien gracias, ¿y usted?	Very well thank you, and you?
5	Ms. Mikes	Muy bien, gracias.	Very well, thanks.

This five-line exchange was recited, almost without variation, at the start of each class session. Any variation occurred just before, or just after: For example, the dress code debate interrupted Ms. Mikes' initial start, but did not alter the exchange once it was said in full. Indeed, Ms. Mikes interrupted herself in line 1, asking whether she "already did that," perhaps having been momentarily distracted because the discussion with Quinn and Cassandra was unlike the average pre-class discussion. Had the ritualized nature of this start-up sequence not been quite clear to me from the start of my observations, Ms. Mikes' reference to it as something that was "done" in line 1 would certainly have confirmed it as such.

This start-up sequence was done to signal the end of the passing period, and the beginning of class. The ritual and what it denoted was itself the meaning: There was no actual information exchanged here because, regardless of how everyone was doing, the questions and answers remained the same. The semantic emptiness of this exchange is noted not only in students' chanted unison, but also in their use of "usted," the formal way to address someone which, with the exception of this particular exchange, students didn't tend to use when addressing Ms. Mikes.

This ritualized start-up sequence marked a daily boundary between non-class time, and class time. Perhaps unsurprisingly, it also often marked a shift between English language use and Spanish language use. While this wasn't always the case for Ms. Mikes, who commonly spoke Spanish before officially starting class, it was quite often

the transition into Spanish for the students, particularly if they hadn't communicated with Ms. Mikes before class officially started. The following section considers ritualized language and code choice in Classroom 204, particularly as they relate to the construct of authenticity.

(In)authenticity, Ritual, and the FL Classroom

The start-up sequence in Classroom 204, like most ritualized exchanges, carried a certain inauthenticity. While there are instances discussed in the sections that follow that characterize Spanish as driving inauthenticity, it is important to note that ritual is rote, by definition, regardless of language context. Much like the exchanged and automatic niceties of English greetings, students gave a positive response ("muy bien, gracias!") without fail, even when students had been sick and out of school. This is not to say that those students were denied a chance to talk about their absence; it simply wasn't within the ritualized start-up sequence. For example, a day after Henry was sick, Ms. Mikes asked him individually how he was before class:

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Ms. Mikes	¿Cómo estás, Henry?	How are you, Henry?
2	Henry	Muy... bien. Bien.	Very.... good. Good.
3	Ms. Mikes	¿No muy bien, pero bien?	Not very good, but good?
4	Henry	Sí. Bien.	Yes. Good.

This exchange deviates from the one above, not only in Henry's answers, but in his hesitation. His automatic response appears to be the preferred "muy bien," but he drew out the word "muy" with a hesitant tone once he began to speak. In this exchange, Ms. Mikes was truly asking Henry about his wellbeing, and the variation from the typical answer reflects that he was aware of the genuine nature of Ms. Mikes' question. Ms.

Mikes, who never had to scaffold student Spanish during the ritualized start-up sequence, did just that here, offering Henry a smoother phrasing to the answer he was getting at. And, of course, unlike the ritualized sequence above, this exchange did not signal the start of class.

In these transcripts we have seen Spanish act as a marker for the beginning of class, and we have seen it used to make meaningful communication happen. In the former example, we have seen students step into what feels like a contrived realm, and in the latter we see Henry and Ms. Mikes actively engaging about Henry's wellbeing. While realms of (in)authentic talk are certainly of interest in considering the spaces (and boundaries) constructed within the FL classroom, it is important to note from these examples that neither language alone necessarily denotes authenticity or inauthenticity. Indeed it is sometimes the combination of Spanish and English that gives way to a localized language practice within Classroom 204. Code choice and authenticity is the topic of the section that follows.

Classroom Expectations: *If you don't know it, it's in your libro!*

Ricky, an exceptionally earnest and enthusiastic thirteen year old, had days when he was, as Ms. Mikes put it, "off the wall". More often than not, Ricky channeled copious amounts of energy into his work, but there were days when his energy was high, but his focus exceedingly low. While doing an individual assignment that involved some new vocabulary, Ricky was struggling to do the assignment independently, asking Ms. Mikes to confirm English translations of various vocabulary items. "Don’t talk about it,

write it!" responded Ms. Mikes. She continued: "If you don't know it, it's in your libro, okay?"

I begin with this example because it aligns largely with research about code choice in the FL environment: The L1 is quite often used for discipline and classroom management purposes (Franklin, 1990; Macaro, 1997; Nagy & Robertson, 2009; Polio & Duff, 1994). While the articles cited here tended to group classroom management and discipline together, these two categories were quite different from one another in Classroom 204, and these differences related directly to code choice.

Classroom management in Ms. Mikes' classroom was quite proactive, meaning that most students knew what was expected of them, and followed the rules. At the start of class, after greeting the students, Ms. Mikes typically continued in Spanish, giving information about what was about to happen. For example, she might announce "Voy chequando la tarea (*I'm coming around to check homework*)", or "Abran los libros a la página doscientos treinte ocho (*Open your books to page two hundred and thirty eight*)". I posit that the predictability of expectations and routines, and the familiarity students have with the vocabulary used for both is what sustains the use of Spanish for these interactions (see Cazden, 2001, p. 103).

Across the examples in English versus those in Spanish, I've found that, as the class period went on, it became more likely that Ms. Mikes would use English to clarify her expectations. Typically, this was when classroom happenings were deviating from the expectation, or when students weren't abiding by her expectations. Ms. Mikes' redirection of Ricky's work above is, indeed, predominantly in English. This example is

one of many that involve some type of redirection from Ms. Mikes, due either to students' not properly fulfilling their tasks, or because logistically there is some change in expectation. For example, towards the end of a class when time seemed to be moving particularly quickly, Ms. Mikes announced to the students "I'm going to give you cinco minutos". This too, is predominantly in English, but not exclusively. Indeed, there are often token uses of Spanish embedded in otherwise English classroom management speech.

Polio and Duff (1994) argue that classroom directions often constitute "the most authentic and natural communication in the classroom", and that neglecting to use the FL for those purposes situates it apart from those markers of real communication (p. 322). This separation between what Spanish and English are used for is indeed indicative of how authentic and inauthentic realms of talk take shape in the FL classroom: While English wasn't the exclusive marker in Classroom 204 for *real* communication, it certainly was the standard for emergent logistical imperatives throughout the class period. Spanish was reserved for more familiar directions and explanations, and was thus ostensibly constitutive of a less urgent communicative agenda.

Still, Ms. Mikes did encourage students to use Spanish in emergent classroom talk. Typically, students integrated the most familiar Spanish terms, such as numbers, into their speech. For instance, when Mary won a piñata at the school-wide auction, and Ms. Mikes found time in her class schedule for the members of Classroom 204 to take it outside to hit, the kids only appropriated the numbers to negotiate who was going to hit the piñata when: "I'm going tres, you're going cuatro," Mary clarified with Ricky, and

she wasn't the only one to make use of Spanish numbers in this way. Interestingly, the use here isn't of the actual ordinal adjectives in Spanish (e.g. third, forth), but the nominal adjectives (three, four). In all, numbers appear to be acceptable tokens of Spanish use in general. Similarly, during a competition, student teams were announcing their current scores to one another in English:

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Student	We have nine.	
2	Ms. Mikes	En español	In Spanish
3	Student	We have nueve.	We have nine

As Ms. Mikes didn't respond with any further feedback, the student's selective translation in line 3 appears to have been acceptable. While the role of Spanish in this exchange appears to be largely so that speakers may say they used it, the code choices in the following section revolve around how crucial the information is that participants are discussing.

Code Choice and Grade Talk: When do we get our tests back?

Students were keenly interested in their grades, both on formal assessments, and their running average in the class. While Ms. Mikes' style wasn't particularly assessment-driven, she certainly responded to student questions. Similar to the issue above of English being used for *real* communication, I found discussion about grades and assessments to most often take place in English. This finding is supported by Levine (2011) who, in reflecting on a previous study (Levine, 2003), notes that "in contexts often deemed most important to students, such as gathering information about tests and course policies... the L1 appears to be the default choice a good deal of the time" (p. 79; see also

McMillan & Turnbull, 2009). Still, it would be misleading to assert that grade-talk took place exclusively in English. While students and Ms. Mikes alike most often used English to talk about test scores and grade calculations, it wasn't entirely uncommon that Ms. Mikes would respond to students in Spanish for other types of assessment-related talk.

For example, during a vocabulary quiz in which Ms. Mikes stated Spanish terms one at a time, for students to write down their translation in English, Ms. Mikes recapped that the previous item "was seís. Oh, no, that was cinco," she corrected herself. She used selective translation of only numbers, with which students are familiar. Here, the importance of student comprehension of the quiz process seemed to outweigh any attempt to say it all in Spanish for authenticity's sake. Miscommunication in the middle of a quiz may have turned into a prolonged language activity in and of itself. Still, some Spanish was used, which indicates some motivation to make use of the language, even in token ways, for genuine communication. Further, this use of Spanish was temporally and spatially aligned with the present, so it that was authentic to the present moment in Classroom 204. Had Ms. Mikes had to temporarily stop progress on the quiz due to a use of Spanish that went misunderstood, that alignment falls apart, because it would have involved repairing miscommunication from the past.

Then, there appeared to be a constant drive for balance for Ms. Mikes between using Spanish in authentic ways, and including English for the ease of comprehension. The importance of the information at hand played a role here, which means that the more crucial the information was, the more likely it would be that English made an appearance.

Still, Ms. Mikes capitalized on instances when there was information to share that students *wanted* to know, that they could benefit from, but that wasn't absolutely crucial. For example, before a day when students needed to bring sneakers Ms. Mikes reminded them in Spanish to do so; and when Ricky wanted to know when to expect their most recent tests back, she answered him in Spanish: "Cuando yo termine calificándolos. Esta semana, pero, probablemente al final de la semana (*When I'm done grading them. This week, but probably at the end of the week*)". Given the relevance of the question to Ricky, Ms. Mikes could likely infer a fair amount of investment on his part in listening for the answer; and, if she was wrong, the information wasn't crucial to his standing in the class.

Sometimes, when Ms. Mikes was conveying information relevant to student academic standing, she made use of English to scaffold their comprehension of Spanish. Typically, this did not involve translation, but strategically used code-switches to facilitate student comprehension. For instance, in reminding students about an upcoming quiz, the following exchange took place:

Line	**Speaker**	**Actual Utterance**	**English Translation**
1	Ms. Mikes	El miércoles va a haber una prueba de gramática- What's the grammar for this chapter?	Wednesday there's going to be a grammar quiz- What's the grammar for this chapter?
2	Mary	Reflexive verbs	
3	Ms. Mikes	Reflexive verbs, when to use an infinitive, and stem changing.	

This short transcript is demonstrative of the type of balance Ms. Mikes often struck in cushioning an authentic use of Spanish with some helpful supplemental

information in English. Her code-switch in line 1 flows nicely, and isn't necessarily unlike code-switching that can be observed in bilingual speech communities: She wasn't translating for student learners, but was modeling bilingual behavior for emergent bilinguals. In so doing, she was sharing relevant information to the students in both languages, with enough of it in English so, should they entirely miss the Spanish message, they may have been able to retroactively infer it, given their previous knowledge of an upcoming quiz.

Also interesting in this exchange is the content of each language: The Spanish delivers predictable (and previously communicated) information about classroom happenings, which corresponds with the findings discussed above. The English communicates grammatical specifics, which in Classroom 204, are almost unfailingly referred to and discussed in English. It appears that Larsen-Freeman's (1997) suggestion to adopt a *both*/*and* approach to understanding SLA applies here as well: While traditionally, literature about code choice in the classroom assumes an *either/or* approach (e.g. *either* Spanish *or* English), it appears to be their combined use as bilingual messages that permit local social authenticity to emerge. The section that follows shifts away from teacher language, and considers student use of English and Spanish.

English as unmarked: Compulsive Clarifications

The preceding section focused on Ms. Mikes as a highly competent bilingual speaker who could fashion bilingual utterances that were both comprehensible and authentic for her emerging bilingual students. Her students, however, weren't as

accomplished in Spanish, and this section considers their challenges around making Spanish a language of authentic communication.

In Classroom 204, there were a number of instances in which students participated in a predominantly Spanish conversation with Ms. Mikes only to conclude it with a translation into English. For instance, in the sequence that follows, Henry had already established that he planned to play in a local golf tournament, and was explaining that, if he won, he would move on to one in North Carolina.

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Henry	Pero, (2s) um, (2s) uh, how would you say like 'if,' like	But (2s) um, (2s) uh, how would you say like 'if,' like
2	Ms. Mikes	Si. Si...	If. If...
3	Henry	Like if I win. Pero, si, uh yo (1s)	Like if I win. But, if, uh I (1s)
4	Ms. Mikes	Gano?	I win?
5	Henry	Excuse me?	
6	Ms. Mikes	Gano.	I win.
7	Henry	Oh, right. Pero si gano, voy a (1s) uh, North Carolina?	Oh, right. But if I win, I'm going to (1s) uh, North Carolina?
8	Ms. Mikes	Mmm	
9	Henry	A un torneo there. But only if I win.	To a tournament there. But only if I win.
10	Ms. Mikes	Pues mucha suerte.	Well good luck.

In line 3 above, Henry makes it clear in English that he is attempting to convey the idea "if I win". Lines 1 through 6 involve Ms. Mikes scaffolding Henry in various ways so that, in line 7, he says "if I win" in Spanish, before continuing his sentence. In line 9, which is the pivotal point of the present analysis, Henry first gives Ms. Mikes additional information about the potential trip to North Carolina, and then qualifies it,

reiterating "But only if I win". This choice is interesting for a few reasons, which are discussed below.

Researchers have increasingly turned their attention to student L1 use in the FL classroom. Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher (2009) considered how conversational functions depend, in part, on interlocutors' socially-situated roles in the FL class: Teacher code-switching, they say, is often understood as a means to ensure student comprehension, which is something we saw in the reminder about the grammar quiz above. Student code-switching, however, is viewed as indicative of inability to continue in the FL (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher, 2009). Similarly, Levine (2009) found that "self-translation.... is not just about ensuring comprehensibility... rather also about fostering a connection to another person" (p. 154).

So, for Henry, his use of English in line 9 may not have been due to inability to continue (which may have been the case in line 3), but about forging a connection between Ms. Mikes and himself: The translation appears to not have been a product of language troubles, but a social choice. Henry's repetition of English here appears to feel necessary for him as a reiteration. While Ms. Mikes was clearly aware of his intended message, as she herself assisted him in articulating it, there appears to be motivation in Henry to restate it in English. While I can't speculate into the source of this motivation, the only conversational function of "But only if I win," appears to be an (English) repetition which, of course, indicates that, to Henry, the previous act of getting that message into Spanish didn't satisfy some type of communicative drive on his part; perhaps he needed to step back into English for it to feel real. This reminds me of one of

Kelsey's strategies during Spanish communication which is to say "Wait, wait wait!" in English, as if putting the Spanish on pause to figure things out, before resuming the Spanish play button; it is as though Spanish is a degree away from on-the-ground, real communication and can thus be subject to 'time outs'.

It is widely documented that the L1 in FL classrooms tends to be used for the most real exchanges, such as to build rapport with students (Polio and Duff, 1994) and for special praise of students (Cook, 2001; Macaro, 1997). Of course, Polio and Duff (1994) point out that this scenario isn't ideal in that it "prevents students from receiving input they might be exposed to in 'real life' situations outside the classroom and reinforces the notion that *English*, not the FL, is the language for genuine communication" (p. 322). Van dam (2003) critiques this situation eloquently noting how any FL-only "constraint is an artificial one introduced solely to construct an 'authentic' rich-input situation…. In case of a real emergency… the constraint can be lifted" (p. 214). Levine (2011) notes that the L1 was the presumed language of social immediacy in the FL classrooms he studied in 2003, and argues that the L1 could even be considered the "unmarked" language choice (Levine, 2011, p. 83).

While this chapter has so far explored the ways by which participants use Spanish and English to construct (in)authentic social spaces within Classroom 204, the remainder of the chapter considers the emergence of Classroom 204 as a unique local space in and of itself.

Go Get an Office: Learning the Spanish of Classroom 204

On the second day of my data collection in Classroom 204, Ms. Mikes told Kelsey to "go get an oficina". I jotted this down, but even with context clues I was unable to figure out what it meant: Kelsey got up from her desk and collected a variety of materials, but none of them was an "office," as far as I was concerned. It took a one-on-one interview with Kelsey, for me to clarify what Ms. Mikes had meant:

Line	Speaker	Interview Transcript
1	Sarah	A little while ago in class, Ms. Mikes told you to get an oficina, Mary asked you why, you said you didn't know. Do you know what an oficina was?
2	Kelsey	Yeah, a big thing to make sure no one cheats off you, like a big paper thing.

Of course it seems obvious now that an *oficina* was the make-shift cardboard carrel that Kelsey had propped up around her work. But at the time, it was not at all clear to me what this piece of Spanish language had referred to, because, although I am bilingual in Spanish and English, I am not native to Classroom 204. There were manifestations of language here that did not correspond with the Spanish I knew from elsewhere, which indicated a specific language community with ways of using Spanish that were not only highly localized, but necessarily socially authentic.

Loan Words and Authenticity

Continuing with the discussion about code choice in the FL classroom, Polio and Duff (1994) appreciate the need to classify language based on communicative function (see Guthrie, 1987; Wing, 1987), but also note the importance of the variation of language *within* each sequence, and thus conducted a microanalysis of sequences of talk

in university FL classrooms. Isolated English terms such as “review section,” “midterm,” and “homework,” which the authors refer to as “administrative vocabulary," constituted the most frequent uses of the L1 (Polio & Duff, 1994, p. 317).

This "administrative vocabulary," can effectively be framed as a class of loan words- words that are adopted within a social setting that often come with a new idea or object that the local language (or the target language, in this case) doesn't provide. While the phenomenon of institution-influenced English seeping into the Spanish of Classroom 204 wasn't prominent (but not unheard of), a similar word-adoption trend was evident almost immediately. Students used select Spanish vocabulary within English exchanges on a regular basis. For example, in following exchange, Ms. Mikes was reminding students how they should organize their papers:

Line	**Speaker**	**Actual Utterance**	**English Translation**
1	Ms. Mikes	If you do your homework, where does it go immediately?	
2	Students	Tarea!	Homework!
3	Ms. Mikes	In tarea! When you do guided notes?	
4	Students	Handouts!	
5	Ms. Mikes	When you do oral questions?	
6	Students	Actividades!	Activities!

In this exchange, the students appear to be speaking more Spanish than Ms. Mikes, but in reality, the participants in this classroom had appropriated certain key Spanish words for their own use in their otherwise English dialogue. *Tarea* (line 2) and *Actividades* (line 6) have a proper noun air to them, in particular because lines 2 and 6 are actually the labels students had in their folder organization system. In that sense, I argue that this exchange is less bilingual, and more monolingual, with isolated adopted proper-

noun-like usage. In other words, within this classroom, words like *tarea* and *actividades* have spilled into the English lexicon.

Perhaps these terms, among a handful of others, were initially adopted as token uses of Spanish, but, at the point in time when I observed, the use of classroom-specific terms didn't mark code-switching, but were instead demonstrative of the local manifestation of Spanish-English contact within the classroom. While the local uses of *tarea* and *actividades* weren't entirely interchangeable with their many meanings beyond Classroom 204 (e.g. the former wasn't used to say "task" and the latter not used to describe weekend pastimes), they had acquired extremely specific local uses (like *oficina*) that were inspired by, if not entirely reflective of, what they typically mean in the "real" Spanish-speaking world. In other words, these words carry an authenticity to them within Classroom 204 that is independent of the world beyond its walls.

Local Authenticity: Gradations of Mock Spanish

The extent to and ways by which language use in the context of the FL classroom is socially authentic has been an emergent theme in the literature over recent decades, particularly in theoretical works (Kanno & Norton, 2003; Kramsch, 1993; van Lier, 1996, 2011). Scholars (Gee, 1999; Levine, 2011) generally agree that language use of any sort is socially situated in some way and is therefore authentic, though the construct of authenticity still often becomes confused between what is culturally authentic to the target community (global), and what is socially meaningful and thus authentic within the FL classroom (local). In the discussion that follows, I focus especially on the tension

between cultural authenticity (that which is imported) and local authenticity (that which has undeniable social meaning within Classroom 204).

In order to explore the tension between local and global authenticities of Classroom 204, I make use of Hill's (2008) Mock Spanish. Hill's basic argument is that there are enough casual, inaccurate and overly simplified, uses of Spanish by monolingual, white Americans, that an actual rudimentary language system has emerged, which she refers to as Mock Spanish. The Anglo invention of Mock Spanish, Hill argues, simplifies and all but makes a joke out of Spanish, through an Anglo lens that is thought to constitute some form of proficiency. Examples of Mock Spanish include the commonly used expressions “no problemo” and “hasta la vista,” the former of which is never heard in Spanish because the word for “problem” is actually "problema", and the latter of which is rarely heard, particularly in the context of the United States where it has a certain Anglo pop-culture ring to it. So, in the grand scheme of things, Mock Spanish can be argued to be a covert form of racism, which largely unintentionally implies that Spanish proficiency is easy (as easy as adding an -o to any English word). Within Classroom 204, I found three different types of manifestations of Mock Spanish.

Quinn's Mock Spanish.

The first of the three manifestations is mostly found in Quinn's contributions in class. Quinn's proficiency wasn't as advanced as her peers, and she was less comfortable with grammatical constructions and vocabulary. She often reverted to English or Mock Spanish for vocabulary items that, had she thought about it, she probably would have known. For example, in the sequence below, Quinn was describing what her family did

on vacation. She had established in Spanish that her family went to Harbor Island, and Ms. Mikes asked what that was:

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Quinn	Es un (.5s) muy (*laughs*)	It's a (.5s) very (*laughs*)
2	Ms. Mikes	¿Una isla?	An island?
3	Quinn	I don't know how to say- yeah, it's really really small.	
4	Ms. Mikes	Tú sabes decir eso	You know how to say that.
5	Quinn	Pequeño. Es pequeño y (*laughs*) yeah.	Small. It's small and (*laughs*) yeah.

Quinn's Spanish contributions were most often *not* Mock Spanish, but it was also fairly common for her to add the Spanish -o to words (e.g. "turn off the lightos"). It also wasn't uncommon for her to take on a foreign-sounding accent to say an English word (e.g. "winter" or "body") when attempting a sentence in Spanish. When asked in an interview whether she ever made up words in Spanish, this is how she responded:

Line	Speaker	Interview Transcript
1	Quinn	Sometimes just kidding you'll add O or OS to the end of the word if you don't know what it is, just like for fun.
2	Sarah	When you do that, do you have a feeling as to whether it's correct?
3	Quinn	It's wrong.

Although it was apparently unintentional, as are many social moves that perpetuate the status of things subaltern, Quinn was participating in the reification and trivialization of the Spanish language through these jokes. Regarding authenticity, there is no local or global authenticity that comes along with Quinn's Mock Spanish: It is as unpassable within Classroom 204 as it would be in Spanish-speaking circles beyond it.

Interestingly, most of her peers also participated in Mock Spanish-like language use and, while they described it to me much like Quinn described her own language use, there are subtle differences between them.

Mock Spanish with a Dose of Self-Reflection.

When asked if they ever made up Spanish words, this is how Mary and Cassandra responded:

Line	Speaker	Interview Transcript
1	Sarah	Do you guys ever make up Spanish words?
2	Cassandra	Like *el toothbrush* or something like that?
3	Sarah	Yes.
4	Mary	Yes, all the time, I've noticed especially like Ricky. He's like *el chair*, or well he knows what chair is.
5	Cassandra	Put like *el* or *la* and then like usually change the ending to like
6	Mary	O
7	Cassandra	O, yeah.
8	Mary	*El, el desko*.
9	Cassandra	Yeah. You say like *la wallo*. Yeah.
10	Sarah	And what does Ms.Mikes- how does she respond?
11	Cassandra	She just says *como? What?* And then she'll tell us what it really is.
12	Sarah	Okay, cool. Do you usually know it's not?
13	Cassandra	Yeah (laughs)
14	Mary	We usually just do it for fun if we don't know what to say.

As Mary noted in line 4, Ricky came up with new Spanish words quite frequently. The difference between his Mock Spanish and Quinn's though, was the extent to which each used Mock Spanish to replace the Spanish expected of them. While Quinn claimed she knew that the Spanish she used is inaccurate, she typically used it when it is her turn to speak- it was filling an expectation of some sort that she use Spanish. Ricky, on the other hand, typically came up with Mock Spanish in instances when he shouldn't necessarily even be talking; his Mock Spanish wasn't a means to fulfill in-class

expectations, but a means to creatively use Spanish beyond the formal proceedings of the classroom.

For instance, one morning Ricky commandeered my audio recorder and began to sing *Soy Guapo*, a song from a popular YouTube video, into it. Instead of abiding by the actual Spanish lines, in which the singer is describing his own green eyes and brown hair, Ricky altered it to reflect his own personal appearance: "Soy guapo, soy muy muy guapo. Tengo ojos azules y pelo rojo y blondé! (*I'm handsome, I'm very very handsome. I have blue eyes and red and blonde hair!*)". His word for "blonde," is Mock Spanish. Ricky himself noted that it was contrived, laughing immediately after its use, saying "I don't know how to say 'blonde'".

Ricky isn't the only one to laugh at his own version of Spanish. Henry, Mary, and occasionally the other students were also likely to take a guess at Spanish words whose English influence was blatant. The words that they landed on were very similar to Quinn's Mock Spanish words. The difference was the element of humor which acted not only as an indication for me that there was an awareness of the inaccuracy of the choice they were making, but it also functioned to save face in the moment by indicating to peers and teacher alike that no one *really* thought this is what Spanish actually was. It was this overt self-reflection that actually sparked something authentic, only within the walls of Classroom 204: While "blondé" meant nothing beyond the classroom, Ricky used it, explained what it meant, and laughed about his own ignorance. Its meaning was clear and that meaning, in part, was to be funny. This combination of factors made this second gradation of Mock Spanish feel more meaningfully real than Quinn's.

Community-Specific Mock Spanish: Two Cases that Walk a Fine Line.

One of the tenets of Hill's (2008) Mock Spanish is that it is a simple and consistent enough deviation from actual Spanish that it hangs together cohesively as a joke that traverses multiple Anglo circles. For example, Quinn's "lightos" or Mary's example of "el desko" are very much aligned with what Mock Spanish looks like everywhere.

The third manifestation of Mock Spanish, however, is different in a couple of ways: It is not likely understandable across multiple Anglo circles, and it does not imply that Spanish is inherently simple- something into which English can be easily converted. The two sections that follow outline two cases of Mock Spanish that are arguably at once mock, in the sense that the Spanish used isn't "real" Spanish, and authentic, in that the Spanish used carries meaning on a consistent basis within the community of Classroom 204.

OMG!: See, I don't think anybody's saying that.

The data for this project were collected a year or two after the wave of texting acronyms were being pronounced in real life speech. That is to say, at the time of data collection the trend of saying “OMG” as shorthand for “Oh My God” had petered out, and residual uses of it in speech had become more ironic than downright "cool" to say. It didn't surprise me then when I noticed Cassandra pronouncing "OMG" using the Spanish pronunciation of the letters. She was translating the acronym, which, of course, means nothing in Spanish. I noticed her doing this at points in the class that were actually acceptable for a socially ironic English use of OMG. But, instead of English, she

was using the Spanish. She wasn't adding *el* or *la*, nor was she adding Spanish-sounding endings. She was actually using Spanish words: They simply didn't mean anything beyond her context. I asked her about her use of OMG:

Line	Speaker	Interview Transcript
1	Sarah	So, Cassandra, you started saying OMG in Spanish. Tell me about that.
2	Cassandra	Um, I don't know. I remember I did that in 6th grade 'cause I thought, 'cause that was back when everyone said "OMG, guys" so then I said it in Spanish 'cause I knew the alphabet. It was just a joke too, I guess. Yeah.

Cassandra's use of "OMG" in Spanish differs from Hill's description of Mock Spanish in two ways. First, Cassandra explained her decision to say "OMG" in Spanish as a result of her *knowledge* of the Spanish alphabet. That is, instead of following the Mock Spanish norm, which is essentially a combined showcase of English-speaking ignorance, and a joke about how easy Spanish could be, Cassandra actually ventured into the Spanish realm of talk with some then-newly-appropriated knowledge. The incompleteness of the knowledge was supplemented by her English proficiency and thus rendered her Spanish mock-like, but that does not appear to be where the origins were. Second, Cassandra qualified her decision to use this mock-like Spanish as a joke: This appears to be a face-saving tactic to ensure that I knew that *she* knew that the Spanish wasn't *real* Spanish beyond the classroom. If nothing else, it was salient to her to share that her Spanish OMG was not a serious attempt at Spanish.

I continued my line of questioning to gauge for whom this Spanish OMG would be a joke, and for whom it might feel like a valid translation, asking Cassandra if she ever sensed that some people don't get the joke: "I don't know," she responded, "I think

people get it, just cause we all used to say it so it's like- but I bet if someone like who I didn't know, they'd be like 'what?'" In other words, Cassandra answered affirmatively that people who hear her say it get the joke because, as she noted, a number of students used to say it. This, however, is specific to the community of Classroom 204 (or, perhaps Spanish class culture at First Street Middle School in general, over a course of years). When Cassandra considered using the Spanish OMG beyond her own language community, in which OMG is a joke that also carries authentic meaning, she noted that hypothetical interlocutors on the outside wouldn't necessarily understand the joke.

This same theme of students noting that the use of Spanish OMG, or similar texting language, wasn't likely prevalent beyond their classroom is evident in the following transcript, in which Kelsey initiates a question about Spanish text-talk:

Line	**Speaker**	**Utterance**
1	Kelsey	Do you guys, like like have like like how we say OMG (*pronounced as an English word*), OMG (*English letters*)?
2	Cassandra	OMG! (*in Spanish*)
3	Kelsey	Do you like actually say that?
4	Ms. Mikes	OMG (*in Spanish*) no.
5	Kelsey	Or when we say like, lol (*pronounced as an English word*), do you say L (*in Spanish*)
6	Cassandra	OLG! (*in Spanish*)
7		(laughter)
8	Henry	See, I don't think anybody's saying that.
9	Ms. Mikes	You know, here's the thing. I have not lived, maybe- I don't Know if señorita Whitehead's lived- I haven't lived in a Spanish speaking country since the dawn of like text messaging, so like (*students laugh*) So, I don't really know. I don't, yeah, I don't know.

This excerpt is particularly interesting because there are different arenas of Spanish-talk being employed and discussed. Cassandra, for example, is operating in the

here-and-now: Within Classroom 204, she is employing classroom-relevant, mock-like talk that functions within this setting (as indicated by the laugh she gets in line 6). Kelsey, on the other hand, is asking how Spanish is used out in the world, beyond Classroom 204, and Ms. Mikes is responding to her. Henry's contribution in line 8 transects the two, shedding light on the discrepancy between Kelsey's and Cassandra's orientations, responding to Cassandra's OLG! (a rushed attempt, I believe, at the letters "LOL") from the evaluative perspective that Kelsey is asking about. While Cassandra's tactics work within the classroom, at times participants look beyond their specific language community to consider the types of language they are preparing themselves to bring out into the world. The following section focuses on a similar use of mock-like Spanish that caused a divide not within the classroom, but between participants in Classroom 204, and some opinionated parents.

The politics of proper nouns.

The students in Classroom 204 typically called their teacher "señora Mikes" which is how she introduced herself at the beginning of the year: with a Spanish pronunciation of “señora” and an English pronunciation of “Mikes”. Over the course of my observations, I noted that most students, if not all, occasionally referred to her or addressed her as “señora Miques”, with both words pronounced in Spanish. According to Ms. Mikes, some Spanish students had initiated this change the previous year and, "it has spread to the whole school with now even the principal calling me señora Miques".

I categorize this phenomenon as another manifestation of mock-like Spanish because it makes use of certain aspects of Spanish (in this case, pronunciation) to shift an

English name into a Spanish-sounding name that isn't a real-world equivalent. It appropriates Spanish, but not fully, nor authentically, as far as the target language community is concerned; the school community has effectively conjured a last name that doesn't exist in Spanish beyond the classroom. In fact, not only is it an unlikely equivalent for a balanced bilingual speaker not affiliated with Classroom 204 to come up with, but it was unacceptable to some parents who, Ms. Mikes told me, "huffily [pointed] out that 'proper nouns shouldn't be translated' and I should not be telling the students to pronounce my name that way!" For the purposes of Classroom 204 (and, indeed, the entire school community), however, Ms. Mikes is also known as Ms. Miques. Within the boundary of First Street Middle School, that "translation," for lack of a better term, is accepted and can therefore be thought of as authentic.

Further, Señora Mikes became Señora Miques through authentic means: Most everyone ended up calling her this, yet no one was mandated to do so. It appeared to happen gradually, catching on for different people at different times until it was widely accepted within the school community, not unlike most new sayings (e.g. OMG). It seems that, for those on the outside of the school culture, proper nouns ought not to be translated perhaps in order to preserve the global authenticity (and avoid the mockery) of those names. This in a sense is a call to ground authenticity in the *real world* ways of saying things, and while Mock Spanish, of which “Señora Miques” is no doubt a manifestation, is theoretically downright *inauthentic*, the insiders' mission wasn't to make a joke or to stake a misguided claim to proficiency: It was to call Ms. Miques what felt natural within their community.

Conclusion

This chapter has introduced some ways by which the participants in Classroom 204 created their FL space through talk. The start of the chapter focused on how ritualized talk marked the temporal boundary of the FL classroom in a relatively inauthentic way, as is quite normal for ritualized exchanges in many social contexts. Discussion then turned to code choice, considering how English and Spanish (and combinations of the two) can mediate socially authentic exchanges in the FL classroom. Finally, attention was turned to the actual speech community of Classroom 204, considering the ways that Spanish is appropriated for unique local use.

Chapter 6 focuses on the ways that students in Classroom 204 tell stories about their lives outside of the classroom. Discussion focuses on the balance they attempt to strike in telling their stories successfully in Spanish, while retaining the real-life feel of the events. The chapter also introduces the term *boundary clash* to describe instances in which classroom participants are operating under different expectations of what is assumed to be real in the FL classroom.

CHAPTER 6

TALKING ALONG THE BOUNDARIES

Chapter 5 established a basic illustration of the ways that talk occurs within various spaces of the FL classroom. This section continues along those lines, with an important shift: Instead of identifying the spaces constructed within and around the FL classroom, this section considers the actual construction and maintenance of boundaries around those spaces. This is done through analysis of the talk that takes place along those boundaries. Specifically, the following section focuses on talk that emerges as authentic in Classroom 204, a key finding from this data being that talk becomes authentic when its meaning is immediately socially relevant to its speakers.

Much of this chapter is dedicated to an analysis of conversations that Ms. Mikes facilitated on Monday mornings (see also Whitehead, 2013). These conversations were about students' weekends, so students were quite literally bringing real events from the outside world into class, and sharing these events was often accompanied by a sense of social urgency. Discussion considers the tactics students and teacher use in striking a balance between using Spanish and effectively making their stories not only *real* to their listeners, but told at all.

The last part of this chapter reviews a series of *boundary clashes* that happen when various classroom participants are operating under different assumptions about what is currently expected in their FL classroom. This discussion is highly attuned to the challenge of authenticity, as in a boundary clash, typically one participant is operating on

a performative or inauthentic plane, and another is operating on a socially immediate, authentic one.

Monday Morning Talks: Bringing the Weekend into Class

Upon beginning observations in Classroom 204, I soon noted instances in which students *really* wanted to share stories with their classmates: Stories they would likely recount to friends in contexts where English, not Spanish, was the accepted linguistic medium; stories there for social purposes, rather than linguistic practice. Students often asked Ms. Mikes' permission to recount these stories in English, rather than Spanish. My understanding of these scenarios was that students' uses for Spanish weren't aligned with socially meaningful interaction: Spanish could be exchanged for English when the message was *actually* important.

That students may reserve Spanish for non-urgent language acts piqued my interest because it pointed to the possibility that Spanish wasn't used for real interactions. Talk about real events in the FL theoretically turns student attention away from an imagined future and instead to an immediate social reality. Further, it disrupts the assumption that the FL be "allocated to communicatively non-essential domains such as drills or dialogue practice, while the mother tongue remains the appropriate medium for discussing matters of immediate importance" (Littlewood, 1981, p. 45). Such talk challenges students to make the present into the moment for which they are learning their language, and is thus rich with information about when, how, and to what extent the FL can meet students' immediate communicative agendas.

On Mondays, Ms. Mikes began her class by talking in Spanish with her students about their weekends: Students were, quite literally, returning into the realm of Classroom 204 after a break, and bringing with them across that boundary some stories to share. While these Monday morning discussions are central to the analysis that follows, there were occurrences of authentic talk at other points in the class as well which I will occasionally refer to. Further, every utterance ever said in Classroom 204 can be analyzed for its various authenticities insofar as how socially meaningful it is, so this particular analysis focuses specifically on real-life events that have taken place *outside* of Classroom 204, that have later crossed the threshold. While in Chapter 5, I considered the ways by which the start of class is signaled, here the focus is not on the boundary itself (the end of the passing period) but on the crossing of information over the classroom boundary; the analysis is therefore messier and more complex.

As noted in previous chapters, there exists a certain preoccupation surrounding the social authenticity of FL use, because often, students are practicing the FL in order to use it "for real" in the future. In short, FL participants must constantly negotiate between their immediate linguistic and social contexts and their respective linguistic and social futures. This all happens *within* an FL classroom setting, and theoretically every moment is thus co-constructed by participants as something that contributes to the present and/or the future, via language practice and/or socially meaningful communication. For example, first language (L1) use for classroom management purposes, a common finding noted in the literature review, exemplifies socially meaningful communication in the immediate present. On the other hand, many FL "exercises, question-and-answer work,

and other *unreal* (non-communicative) things" share no reciprocity with the immediate social environment of the classroom, and are therefore symbolically situated beyond it (Clark, 1981, p. 153, italics in original). These two examples each quite clearly fall into one temporal realm (i.e. present or future) and into one language realm (language practice or social communication): My assertion is that most language sequences in their entirety don't fit neatly into these categories, and are negotiated by participants as they co-construct the temporal and linguistic spaces within Classroom 204. In so doing, they are engaging in the push and pull that characterizes negotiation, constructing the various shores of their classroom not only by talking within the boundaries (as discussed in the previous chapter), but in actually developing these boundaries by talking along them.

Specificity and Predictability

As in the previous chapter, in which the predictability of in-class happenings was discussed, predictability was also present in student talk on Monday mornings. For example, Ricky and Henry played golf on weekends. The consistency with which they played created a predictable ritual for Monday's weekend discussions. Variations in the information the boys shared from one week to the next were fairly mundane and usually related to location, score, or the day the boys played. The transcript that follows includes much of this generalized, predictable ritual until line 6, when Ms. Mikes poses a familiar question that neither boy appears able to answer:

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Henry	Y, uh, y lunes uh, uh, primero yo ah jugo el golf con-	And, uh, Monday, uh, uh, first I, ah, play[1]
2	Ms. Mikes	Jugué, you'd say, jugué	I played. You'd say I played.
3	Henry	Jugué el golf con Ricky.	I played golf with Ricky.
4	Ms. Mikes	Sí. Y?	Yes. And?
5	Henry	Y, um	And, um,
6	Ms. Mikes	Y quién ganó?	And who won?
7	Henry	[[Ah...	
8	Ricky	[[Ah...	
9	Ms. Mikes	Fue un empate?	Was it a tie?
10	Ricky	Sí.	Yes.

Here, we see that the word for "tie" doesn't come easily to the boys. In fact, arguably, both boys strategically prompt Ms. Mikes to ask if it were a tie in line 9 when they fail to answer such a straightforward, familiar question as "who won?". Because of the predictable nature of the question Ms. Mikes poses in line 9, Ricky is able to answer her question affirmatively in line 10. This all unfolds in Spanish, even when a new scenario (there was no winner) arises.

Although the typical golf talk is highly predictable and fairly general, Henry occasionally does talk about golf in a more specific way. In the excerpt that follows, the information is more specific, and both content and conversational path become less predictable:

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Henry	... And then, um, y domingo yo, um, jugo el golf en a tournament?	...And then, um, and Sunday, I, um, play golf in a tournament?
2	Ms. Mikes	Un torneo.	A tournament
3	Henry	Un torneo? Y yo, how d- how do you say made? Like I m-	A tournament? And I, how d- how do you say made? Like I

			ma-
4	Ms. Mikes	Hice	I made
5	Henry	How?	
6	Ms. Mikes	Hice.	I made
7	Henry	Hice un doce (.5s) um, on a hole which (inaudible)	I made a twelve (.5s) um, on a hole which (inaudible)
8	Ms. Mikes	Ah. Esto es el día, entonces, que fue en el torneo que jugaste mal	Ah, that's the day, then, it was in the tournament that you played badly.
9	Henry	Sí. Muy muy mal.	Yeah, very very badly.
10	Ricky	Uff.	Uff
11	Ms. Mikes	Lo siento.	I'm sorry.
12	Henry	It was bad. Well it was funny.	

Unlike his more general golf reports that typically stated when he played, and whether he won, Henry presents information here that deviates from the typical report. The first new piece of information (for which Henry lacked the vocabulary) is that he was actually playing in a tournament (line 1). Further, he not only reports his score, but he contrasts it with what was presumably the par of that hole- something I haven't otherwise witnessed in Henry's golf talk. Lastly, Henry typically made it well known that he often wins. Playing badly was thus noteworthy and new in the context of these Monday morning discussions (lines 8 and 9). The three pieces of this story that differentiate it from his typical narrative, point to the possibility that Henry had enough investment (and not enough FL resources) in telling the story to make use of English to tell it; and it is the specificity of the story- the pieces that deviate from his more common, generalized narrative- that pushed him to do so.

In integrating more specific information into his golf narrative, Henry arguably made it more real for himself and his interlocutors. This passage seems reflective of something that very much happened, whereas "I played golf Saturday and I lost" may or

may not satisfactorily represent a real world experience; it may simply be an engagement in the Spanish language ritual rather than the meaningful telling of a story.

Unpredictable Narratives, Important Information and Investment

When asked in an interview about what type of stories she preferred to recount in Spanish on Mondays, Kelsey explained that "if it's something in depth we have to talk about it's hard to say if we don't know all the words". When asked for an example of something "in depth," she refers to a "Wizard Quest" she participated in on vacation.

During the Monday morning discussion that followed that vacation, Ms. Mikes asked Kelsey the typical initiation question: "Qué hiciste? (*What did you do?*)" Students often responded with the phrase "yo fui (*I went*)," followed by a location. In this particular instance, Kelsey first explained in Spanish that she went to a hotel and a water park before introducing the Wizard Quest and requesting to use English:

Line	Speaker	Utterance	English Translation
1	Kelsey	Y and hay un Wizard Quest?	And there's a Wizard Quest?
2	Ms. Mikes	Qué es eso?	What's that?
3	Kelsey	Can I say it in English, it's so hard to explain.	
4	Cassandra	[It will be so much better!	
5	Ms. Mikes	[Okay	
6	Kelsey	Okay, well it's like this thing and you get a wand and you get this book and then you go to this magical tree and it's like all across the hotel and you go to this tree and then you go on a quest? And you have to go across the hotel looking for these things to complete the quest and you wave your wand at it? And you can become like a super	

		wizard? And I became (.5s) a master wizard which is like the highest rank (*laughs*). So now, I am now a master wizard.	

Kelsey's lengthy explanation of the Wizard Quest is perhaps the longest turn taken by anyone in any of the Monday morning transcripts, indicating that she had a lot to say that was very much independent of language practice; in this case her investment in sharing this highly specific (or "in depth") event with her class eclipsed any opportunity to make use of Spanish. And yet we see her step into English quite gradually: In line 1, the linguistic structure of her utterance is fairly common, and yet she integrates an English proper noun ("Wizard Quest"), which passes as appropriate. Ms. Mikes' prompt in line 3 requires that Kelsey explain something highly specific that she certainly couldn't do in Spanish. While I cannot speculate into Ms. Mikes' motive (if, indeed she consciously had any in this moment) in asking this, I can observe the effect it had: Kelsey immediately requested in English to answer the question in English. That is to say, the meaning embedded in the answer that Kelsey had to share took immediate precedence over the linguistic ritual. Typically there is negotiation between students in Ms. Mikes that seeks to strike a balance between using as much Spanish as possible while still successfully conveying a story. In this case, however, Kelsey appeared certain she was willing to forfeit this sought-after balance of Spanish use for authentic purposes: Van Dam (2003) is referenced in Chapter 5 as saying that foreign language-only expectations could be lifted in the case of an emergency. It appears that Kelsey was declaring a social emergency of sorts.

And, as we see in line 4, Kelsey is not alone in her eagerness to convey her story to classmates: Cassandra pleads for Ms. Mikes to permit the code-switch, offering the reasoning that the telling of the story will be "so much better" if English is permitted. While this is perhaps the most blatant example in my data of a student justifying English use, it is not an isolated one ("It's very complicated!" explained Henry before he blurted out in English that he nearly beat the world record for underwater juggling). In supporting Kelsey's request, Cassandra indicates her own stance insofar as the uses of Spanish and English in this instance: Kelsey's story is worth telling in the immediate social realm and, in order to do this properly, the linguistic ritual that may gloss over the real-world specifics of the Wizard Quest must not be prioritized. Once Kelsey explains the Wizard Quest in English, the conversation continues:

Line	**Speaker**	**Actual Utterance**	**English Translation**
6	Kelsey	…So now, I am now a master wizard.	
7	Student	Woo. (*claps*)	
8	Ms. Mikes	Ah, impresionante! Okay,	Oh, impressive! Okay,
9	Kelsey	Wait, wait! And then después yo voy a North Carolina.	Wait, wait! And then after I go to North Carolina

Kelsey's use of English in line 9 contrasts with Ms Mikes' use of Spanish in the previous line and therefore treads on the re-instituted Spanish-use context. And yet, English is not used extensively in this case, but as a simple way for Kelsey to gain back the floor before returning to a more general use of Spanish to continue explaining her vacation. Then, a simple summation of this data is that Kelsey's investment in giving the Wizard Quest description was high enough for her to ask permission to use English,

whereas, in line 9 her use of English was not meant to help her tell another story, but was a matter of helping her regain conversational control of the floor, so that she could continue in Spanish. Interestingly, it appears that the urgency with which Kelsey asserts her desire to regain the floor most naturally happens in English, but it is her transition to Spanish that permits her to continue speaking: This type of code-switching from the L1 to FL as a means to hold conversational control is also noted by Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher (2009).

In our interview, Kelsey contrasted the "in-depth" example of the Wizard Quest with something more basic: "If it's something like 'I went to a friend's house' it's easy". When asked for further examples, she offered: "I went to dinner, or I went to the beach, or like I went to a different place like the vacation stuff." So, Kelsey's explanation of her decisions around language choice resemble the above analysis on Henry's golf discourse: That the more predictable the content is and the more controlled the specific variables are (i.e. location, in the case of these examples), the more likely she is to use Spanish. Further, when asked whether she leaves details out when she doesn't know the words for them, she says she does, because "sometimes you just give… shorter answers so you don't have to think that hard about every single word," which speaks to the balance students seem to be negotiating between using very basic Spanish to bring their experiences into Classroom 204, and preserving the authenticity of those experiences. When I pointed out to Kelsey that she didn't want to leave the details about the Wizard Quest out, she responded: "I think I was excited about it". So, once again, student investment may put a damper on Spanish use. High specificity and low predictability

might be thought of as inherently linked to the realness of stories: The extent to which they are steeped in real-world details likely makes their recounting increasingly socially urgent, and increasingly linguistically challenging. Then, one way that participants manage the challenge of authenticity in their FL classroom is by negotiating a balance between high specificity and low predictability, and the difficulty of the Spanish they use. The ways in which this negotiation is realized sometimes blends the discourse categories, a phenomenon that is looked at in the following section.

School Versus Social Speak in Classroom 204

While the previous sections have focused on English as representative of an immediate social realm, and Spanish as more detached and practice-oriented, it is important to note that languages themselves aren't uniquely indicative of authenticity. Indeed, often students made use of Spanish and English at once and, in so doing, they created a third space authenticity that reflects precisely what it was to be an FL student in a social-educational context in Classroom 204. This is particularly evident in students' discussion about movie *The Hunger Games* the Monday after it was released in theatres.[5] All seven students had something to say about the movie and they and Ms. Mikes had to negotiate between English and Spanish in order to create socially pertinent, Spanish meaning within Classroom 204. The authenticity of this process, as well as of the information being shared, is of interest here.

Below, Mary initiates a sequence about her father's choice to read the books by Suzanne Collins that the movie *The Hunger Games* is based on. While she initially is

[5] This transcript is provided in its entirety in Appendix II.

very much in the student role, requesting information of her teacher, there is a point at which Ms. Mikes and Mary break free of their student-teacher roles and the conversation becomes more representative of an exchange between social equals.

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Mary	Mi padre (2s) Cómo se dice wanted to be cool-[6]	My dad (2s) How do you say wanted to be cool?
2	Mary	Wanted to be cool. Wants to be cool?	
3	Ms. Mikes	Quiere.	Wants
4	Mary	Quiere	Wants
5	Ms. Mikes	Ser.	To be
6	Mary	Ser (1s) Frío? (*laughs*)	To be (1s) ... cold (*laughs*)
7	Ms. Mikes	Cool, no- cool's always hard. It- it- [it's so like	
8	Mary	[Fun, okay, I'll just	
9	Ricky	Divertido	Fun
10	Ms. Mikes	Depending on which language it is or even that like dialects of the language but,	
11	Mary	Divertido	Fun
12	Ms. Mikes	Yeah, divertido, o	Yeah, fun, or
13	Mary	So, um, um, él, I mean usted, um, lee uh, los	So, um, um he, I mean you, um reads, uh, the
14	Ms. Mikes	no, *él* lee los- leyó los libros	No, *he* reads the- read the books
15	Mary	Leyó los libros	He read the books.
16	Ms. Mikes	Ah, y le gustaron?	Oh, and did he like them?

Here we see Mary initiate this sequence in which she was reporting that her father began reading *The Hunger Games* trilogy upon seeing the movie. In lines 3-6 we see scaffolding on Ms. Mikes' part in that she was paving Mary's way with the vocabulary Mary implicitly stated herself as needing in line 1. In line 6, upon venturing an incorrect

[6] Ms. Mikes briefly interrupts Mary to tell Henry to be quiet. Henry apologizes just as Mary continues in line 2.

guess (albeit one that she didn't seem to take seriously), Mary alters the flow of the conversation in that she takes a step forward without Ms. Mikes' help. In line 8, perhaps based on Ms. Mikes' indication that there isn't an obvious choice in translating the word "cool," Mary changes the course of her own story a bit (for the sake of the language ritual, apparently, as the story itself is somewhat altered as a result), and decides on a different word to use without Ms. Mikes' guidance. We see Ms. Mikes acknowledge Mary's choice in line 12, and it appears she was about to offer an alternative as well, but Mary continues on her own.

Over the course of the remainder of this sequence we see Ms. Mikes and Mary negotiate for control of the conversation. If we consider Cazden's (2001, Chapter 3) explanation of the common classroom initiation-response-feedback sequence, it becomes clear that there are some aspects to the sequence that are intact, and others that are not, leaving a certain ambiguity as to whether this exchange follows the norms of a classroom, or the norms of an informal social interaction. For instance, we note that Mary's decision to use "divertido" was never prompted by teacher initiation, although it did ultimately receive feedback in line 12. Later, Mary was given grammatical feedback in line 14, but once she corrected her own utterance in line 15, the response from Ms. Mikes was one of a conversational interlocutor, providing a response token not in response to Mary's language use, but in response to her story. This blend of classroom and social discourses is a fascinating demonstration of how participants in Classroom 204 co-constructed their linguistic and social realities across temporal and linguistic realms. In deviating from the traditional initiation-response-feedback sequence of classroom

discourse, the participants were able to strike a balance of authenticity for the purposes of their unique speech situation; unlike the ritualized sequences we saw in Chapter 5, spontaneous discourse patterns such as these necessitate a certain social immediacy.

¿Cómo Se Dice *Loophole*?: Self-scaffolding in Storytelling

There were numerous instances of storytelling in which limited use of English was embedded in Spanish utterances. A common phrasing that students made use of in order to do this was "cómo se dice… (*how do you say*...)" followed by an important component of the story itself. For example:

Line	Speaker	Utterance	English Translation
25	Mary	Pero, um la (1s) fin, final ah, ah, novela es muy (3s). Cómo se dice depressing?	But, um the (1s) end, ending ah, ah, novel is very (3s). How do you say 'depressing'?
26	Ms. Mikes	Deprimente	Depressing
27	Mary	De-deprimente	De-depressing

Interesting in this type of utterance is the use of "cómo se dice" in line 25: Because the English in this sentence did effectively tell the story, it seems that "cómo se dice" was a loophole that allowed Mary to use English by requesting the vocabulary that, for the purpose of getting the story told, becomes unnecessary. It is Mary's initial statement, then, that was most authentic to the culture of Classroom 204: She is relaying the information she wants to seamlessly, and overcomes her own lack of knowledge of Spanish by framing the English she needs in some Spanish that points to her novice role. In effect, this is how storytelling was sometimes accomplished in Classroom 204.

The two lines that followed Mary's storytelling (26 and 27) were an exchange that happened for the sake of Spanish class. Ms. Mikes responded to Mary with the requested

vocabulary term, and Mary repeated that term. In doing this, two things happened: First, Ms. Mikes responded as a teacher with information, rather than a listener with a social response. Second, between the offering and uptake of the relevant vocabulary term, nothing meaningful happened; the story had already been told. Lines 26 and 27 effectively provided Mary with a Spanish vocabulary term that was no longer relevant for the present, but perhaps would become useful in the future. In effect, these two lines turned the orientation of the sequence from present meaning to potential future language use.

In other cases, it is not a single word, but an entire phrase that students insert after asking “cómo se dice?” The FL script generally mandates that the syntactic slot that follows this phrase is a single word whose Spanish equivalent is being requested; the conversational slots that follow are first an offering of that word, and then student integration of the word into their talk. In breaking this one-word expectation, the result has some potential for humor. For instance, Cassandra makes use of this story-telling loophole by asking "Yo (*I*)- cómo se dice 'ran into a wall'?" In doing this, she tells a comical story, as Mary did above, and arguably does so in a funny way, because "ran into a wall" deviates from the mundane list of expected vocabulary items in an FL class. In parting from the FL script, and even making use of it to assert some humor, Cassandra is pushing her own narrative into an authentic realm: One that bridges together the FL classroom expectations with a story that, had she paused and asked for individual lexical items (ran, into, wall), likely would have become detached from its own status as a story, and from the humor that came with Cassandra’s method of telling.

In the sequence below, Quinn, like Cassandra, asks how to say a whole phrase. She is recounting part of the movie *The Hunger Games*, but unlike Cassandra, Quinn doesn't buffer her English with "Cómo se dice…?":

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
36	Quinn	Oh, oh, Peeta dice, um, nosotros, in (*pronounced 'een'*), hang on I got this	Oh, oh Peeta says, um, we in (*pronounced een*), hang on I got this
37	Mary	Amor?	Love
38	Kelsey	It's a quote?	
39	Student	Amore? What does that mean?	Love[4]? What does that mean?
40	Quinn	In amore y (1s) how do you say 'feel free to kiss me any time'?	
41	Ms. Mikes	Y (1.5s) bésame cuando quieras. Bésame cuando quieras. Sí?	And (1.5s) kiss me whenever you want. Kiss me whenever you want. Yeah?
42	Students	(*All begin to talk loudly in English; inaudible)*	

That Quinn asks in English how to say the quote is at best a vague acknowledgement that this sequence might involve some language practice, but she is not integrating it with any Spanish as we saw Mary and Cassandra do above. Instead, it would seem that Quinn is not cooperatively participating in the negotiation of temporal realms and linguistic purposes, because she is uniquely oriented to the purely social act of asserting herself as a fan of the movie. As seen above, when Ms. Mikes offers vocabulary items they often pave the way for students to continue their stories, even when the English has effectively already done so. One indication that Quinn is not receptive to Ms. Mikes' attempts at finding the balance between language practice and social exchange is that, unlike Mary, Quinn does not repeat the translation that Ms. Mikes offers: Her

contribution may come with a social authenticity, but it is inconsistent with the culture of Classroom 204 in a variety of ways. Interestingly, it is this very exchange that dismantles the order in the classroom, and all students begin to chat in English about the movie, as they might at lunchtime or during a passing period. In the above transcript Ms. Mikes' translation in line 41 is actually partly drowned out by inaudible discussion in English about *The Hunger Games*, after which the transcribed sequence continues:

Line	**Speaker**	**Actual Utterance**	**English Translation**
46	Ms. Mikes	Esperen! Le toca a Quinn.	Wait! It's Quinn's turn!
47	Quinn	Cave scene, it's the cave scene.	
48	Henry	Oh, there's a cave scene!	
49	Ms. Mikes	La escena en la cueva (*laughs*)	The cave scene (*laughs*)
50	Students	(*erupt into inaudible chatter again* 5 s. Some pieces audible)	
51	Mary	Well the first one was only cheek.	
52	Ms. Mikes	You know, I'm going to start charging you lempiras, I'm going to take away lempiras if I hear English.	

In this excerpt, the only person speaking Spanish is Ms. Mikes, and it's echoing Quinn's use of English. Ms. Mikes appears to be trying to reign her students back in, first in line 46 when she gains the floor back for Quinn, and then in line 49, when Ms. Mikes translates a phrase that is not adopted in the next utterance. Again, that Quinn does not repeat the phrase may indicate she is very intent on getting the story told, which she has done, and the linguistic ritual of repeating the phrase is deemed unnecessary. Typically, Ms. Mikes did not threaten students to take away lempiras, which was the currency of the classroom economy. In that sense, the extent to which students erupted into English and spoke over one another in this particular excerpt was an anomaly;

however the point of interest here relates to the investment students appear to have in discussing *The Hunger Games* which not only prompts them to take control of this very specific (including a verbatim movie quote in line 40) discussion, but it prompts them to make use of English to do so.

Boundary Clashes

Bourdieu (1977, p. 20) and Erickson (2004, pp. 6-7) both make use of the Greek distinction between *kronos* and *kairos* time, the former being the measurable, minute-by-minute structure of time that relates to schedules, calendars, and a bell ringing to signal the start of class. The latter, kairos time, refers to the quality of the time. In a classroom, this type of time might be classified as individual work time, lecture time, listening comprehension time, and so on. While these categories may be divided up by a teacher according to kronos time, the propriety of what type of discourse and action that happens in each is a kairos issue. Conceiving of time in these ways permits us to stretch beyond the imagined communities framework, whose focus is on spatial and kronos-time temporal realms, to include the notion that there may be different kairos temporal realms within the very FL classroom, as observable by participant boundary-making.

An example of this are the different uses for students' first and foreign languages inside the classroom. Expectations surrounding first and second language use in classrooms illuminate where symbolic boundaries are, be they physical (Once you're in the classroom, no English!), semantic (grammar lessons are often taught in the native language), or logistical (classroom management or disciplinary purposes). There are presumably different rules (and therefore different boundaries) for different types of

discourse, which is illuminating insofar as participants' understandings of the realness of the discourse in which they are engaging. Indeed, at times the participants of Classroom 204 were operating under different assumptions of kairos time, and thus the incompatible boundaries that various participants are constructing came to light and needed to be re-negotiated.

To conclude the discussion of the ways that language and social work is done along the boundaries of the FL classroom, I will highlight some instances of what I call *boundary clashes*. Specifically, these are instances in which, for a variety of reasons, the symbolic boundaries within which various participants are functioning don't align with one another, causing confusion, miscommunication, or sometimes even humor.
For example, Quinn appeared generally aware that she tended to overuse English. One morning, Classroom 204 was in a moment of transition, and Quinn asked Ms. Mikes in English if she could use the bathroom:

Line	**Speaker**	**Actual Utterance**	**English Translation**
1	Quinn	Can I go to the bathroom?	
2	(2s)		
3	Quinn	¿Puedo ir al baño?	Can I go to the bathroom?
4	Ms. Mikes	Ah, sí. Perdón. I'm sorry, I wasn't listening.	Oh, yeah, sorry. I'm sorry, I wasn't listening.

This simple example is a good illustration of how students in particular have to do some negotiation work in order to participate in the discourse that is expected of them. In this case, Quinn appears to be operating under the assumption that Ms. Mikes was forcing her student into a Spanish-only realm so that her "private physical needs [could be] publicaly topicalized" (van Dam, 2003, p. 214). In fact, Ms. Mikes was actually doing no such thing; she very simply hadn't heard.

A more common type of clash in Classroom 204 had to do with the degree of authenticity participants were attributing to the task at hand. The nature of much FL discourse is generally fairly contrived. As noted previously, there is much practice of language for future exchanges, but not much talk that actually exchanges new meaning in the moment. At times in Classroom 204, one participant was operating within FL-language-practice mode, while another one was actively trying to make meaning in the present. For example, in the below transcript, students were working independently on writing some sentences in Spanish:

Line	**Speaker**	**Utterance**
1	Erica	How do you say 'done,' when you're finished? Fin?
2	Ms. Mikes	No, what's your sentence?
3	Erica	Oh, I- I'm done.
4	Ms. Mikes	Oh, aca- acabado, you can say that.

In this example, we see Ms. Mikes operating in the mode that she typically needed to in order to support student sentence-writing: In coming up with individual sentences, students often needed vocabulary words that she offered to them. Erica, however was not focused on completing the practice task, but was inquiring about how to announce, in real-time, that she had finished the task. In other words, Ms. Mikes was initially poised to help Erica practice, while Erica was asking for support to actually exchange meaning in the present moment.

While the above example has to do with whether the task itself was perceived as authentic social exchange or language practice, the examples that follow involve student orientation to the task as being socially- versus student-oriented. For instance, Ms. Mikes called on Ricky to complete a Spanish sentence as part of an oral exercise from the

textbook (Humbach et al., 2006, p. 240). He did this and, after doing so, was prompted by Ms. Mikes to complete the book's directions, and state whether this sentence was true or false for him:

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Ricky	Yo siempre me lavo los dientes por la mañana	I always brush my teeth in the morning.
2	Ms. Mikes	¿Es cierto?	Is that true?
3	Ricky	Sí. Of course.	Yes. Of course.
4	Ms. Mikes	Claro que sí.	Of course.
5	Ricky	Claro que sí.	Of course.

Ricky's tone in line 3 is steeped in good-humored attitude, as though he was offended at the very question. Of course, he knew that Ms. Mikes was asking because of language practice, but this example illustrates one fault line between a language-centered task and a social one for students. The example that follows actually involves some miscommunication between Mary and Ms. Mikes because Mary is making a joke that Ms. Mikes misreads as a novice mistake. The sequence begins with a different student, Erica, translating a sentence she was assigned:

Line	Speaker	Utterance	English Translation
1	Erica	Ricardo se pone- I forgot how to say 'shirt'.	Ricky puts on- I forgot how to say 'shirt'.
2	?	Camisa!	Shirt!
3	Mary	Blusa!	Blouse!
4	Ms. Mikes	No, that would be-	
5	Mary	Blouse- for a girl!	

Mary laughed and smiled at Ricky jokingly as she blurted out line 5- a qualifier that proved her language competence had allowed her to make a joke (not that her novice status had caused a mistake). Ricky smiled back, knowing she was making a friendly

joke. While Ms. Mikes was approaching this task as teacher, with Mary as a learner in mind, Mary was approaching it as an opportunity to create some social banter. In other words, Ms. Mikes was operating in a language classroom world, while Mary was operating in a social one, and both of these worlds were coexistent in that moment in Classroom 204. Indeed, given this constant scenario that any talk can comprise a social or a school realm, it is surprising that participants didn't have to negotiate more boundary clashes than they did. Then again, perhaps it is unsurprising that they were so very adept at negotiation, given it is essentially a constant in any social sphere.

Unveilings: When Boundary Clashes Are Brought to Light

It was late in the class period, and the students were playing charades with the vocabulary list they would be quizzed on the next day. It was Erica's turn and she frantically gestured with her hands, and danced around the room, alternating between giggles and imploring stares to her peers who were unable to guess her vocabulary item. After a series of failed attempts at answers, Henry made a joke: "Loca?" He guessed. "Crazy?"

This is one of many manifestations of Henry's most common joke: He goes off-script, so to speak, and thus deviates from typical FL student talk. As is the case with most discourse moves that are unexpected, the result is humor. And, indeed, his peers laughed at his suggestion that Erica looked crazy, so that might be the vocabulary term she is embodying, even though "loca" wasn't on the vocabulary list.

Interesting is that, by going off script in this way, Henry is pointing to all the layers that had been compiled to make an alternately laughing and serious, frantically

gesturing Erica seem *not* crazy. So his joke was, in part, capitalizing on the farce of the context: It was funny because, if one stays focused on charades rules and expectations, and the current vocabulary list, *loca* isn't an obvious answer. Because of the nature of the game charades, the FL context isn't necessary for this joke to work: Perhaps Henry's budding competence in Spanish, in venturing beyond his current vocabulary list, contributed to the humor value of this particular joke but, theoretically, the joke still works outside of Classroom 204. The next example replaces the game of charades with the contrived context of the FL environment to illustrate one of Henry's unveilings of a true FL boundary clash.

I Thought We *Weren't* In Spain: Unveiling the Sway of Authority

One morning, students were paired up for a class competition. Each group of students had a mini white board and dry-erase marker, and they were poised to translate a number of English sentences into Spanish.

"Y'all eat pizza," Ms. Mikes read aloud, and students went to work. After a couple of moments, Ms. Mikes prompted students in Spanish to show their white boards. The first three pairs had all written "Vosotros coméis pizza," which makes use of the Iberian *vosotros* form. Students had chosen this likely because of the informal register of the verb, which corresponds roughly with "y'all". Ms. Mikes awarded each group a point.

Henry, who was the only student working alone, had written "Ustedes comen pizza," making use of what, in Spain, would be the more formal option but that, most everywhere else, does not have a formal connotation. Ms. Mikes didn't give Henry the same positive evaluation she had the previous groups: "Hmmm, "she hesitated from

saying it was downright wrong. "Where could this be right?" She asked the class as a whole.

"Everywhere but Spain!" a number of students exclaimed.

"Well," exclaimed Henry triumphantly, "I thought we *weren't* in Spain".

Not only did this get Henry the competition point, but he once again unveiled a boundary clash: Had Henry not pointed to the obvious fact that Classroom 204 existed outside of Spain, he may not have won his point, which implies that all other parties in the classroom were operating under tacit "in-Spain" expectations for the sake of the present task. Like the previous example, in which no one noticed Erica's craziness because they were focused on charades, no one here appeared to notice the discrepancy between their "only in Spain" answers, and the fact that Classroom 204 was most definitely not in Spain. In other words, it was almost as though participants didn't register their actual geographical location as "counting" for the sake of this activity; what counted, it appears, was Ms. Mikes' use of "y'all" which indicated which answers would receive the point. The authority of this local activity actually pulled participants away from using the Spanish that would most likely be useful just outside their classroom doors.

This chapter began with an analysis of the ways by which students told their weekend stories. The specificity and predictability of stories, and their relationship with authenticity, were reviewed, along with student investment in telling those stories. Further, deviation from traditional classroom discourse appeared to lend itself to

authenticity, while "self-scaffolding" with "cómo se dice" appeared to have mixed results.

The chapter concluded with a series of examples of boundary clashes, including the final example in which Henry hadn't used "vosotros". In gleefully declaring that he was *not* in Spain, Henry unveiled the previously covert sway of Ms. Mikes' tacit expectations. The role of local authority as a manufacturer of local classroom value is a topic that will be discussed in Chapter 7.

Chapter 7 focuses first on localized value in Classroom 204, considering how specific criteria in language tasks earn students points within the classroom, but may have little real-world value. The chapter includes an extensive analysis of the classroom's unit of currency, the *lempira* and the in-class language market that it fuels. The final portion of the chapter considers the value of Spanish beyond the walls of Classroom 204, specifically regarding whether Iberian or Latin American Spanish will be more useful to students in the real world.

CHAPTER 7

SYSTEMS OF VALUE

Students had just finished listening to *Cuerpo Sano, Mente Sana,* a Spanish-language "rap" that was included as a supplement to their textbook, *Exprésate* (Humbach, et al., 2006). While listening, students had been focused on a lyrics sheet; their task had been to listen for and fill in the missing words and phrases. Now, the class was going over the answers together, and individual students were keeping track of how many correct answers they had gotten: The student with the most, would win a *lempira*, which could be put toward bonus points on a future quiz or test.

The class had arrived at the line: "_____ un poco antes de salir," (_____ *a little before going out*) and students were venturing some guesses that vaguely sounded like the answer, ″estírate" (*stretch*), but only Henry landed on it precisely:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
1	Henry	Estírate?
2	Ms. Mikes	That's it!
3	Henry	Wait, E-S-T-I-R-A-T-E? (*spelled in English*)
4	Ms. Mikes	Yes!
5	Henry	Yes! I got that!
6	Ms. Mikes	What's it mean?
7	Henry	I don't know, but I got it!

And, because the stipulation of the task was that students fill in the blank with the correct answer, it didn't matter that Henry had no idea what it meant: Getting the answer here (and thus getting the point) was not a matter of knowing what the words meant.

This chapter first explores the various aspects of task authenticity, particularly relating to how engaging in tasks produces symbolic value for students. Subsequent parts of the chapter address many facets of value within and beyond Classroom 204.

Task-Specific Language Competence: Highly Local Manifestations

The nature of language competence is such that the more competent we are as language users, the more we are able to produce and respond to language with nuances that suit our particular social context. As examined in previous chapters, there were interactions within Classroom 204 that prepared student competence for future encounters, and there were interactions that were socially situated in the immediate social-academic context of Classroom 204, which afforded students opportunities to practice their local competence in the Spanish of their classroom. This section considers the effect that grading, competitions, and other academic exchanges of goods specific to Classroom 204 had on student demonstrations of language competence.

Students were attuned to varying expectations during different parts of class time, and were adept at determining what "counted" as competence that was worthy of academic points. They tailored their performance accordingly. As seen with Henry above, student orientation to what counts within the classroom for purposes of academic standing generally was high, and most often trumped any musings about how local manifestations of language competence (e.g. being able to spell the word *estírate*, but not knowing its meaning) might fare beyond Classroom 204. For instance, in many simple vocabulary games in Classroom 204, the plural and singular for nouns both counted as the right answer: In the real world, one has to differentiate between *hombro* and *hombros*

(shoulder and shoulders), but in some competitions in Classroom 204 this piece of meaning was obsolete. Similarly, when translating an English sentence into Spanish during a competition, Cassandra asked: "It doesn't matter if there's an accent (mark), right? I mean, in real life it does, but for this does it?" And she was correct on both counts: In real life the accent marks matter, but for the purposes of getting a correct answer, they did not.

The contrived nature of local types of language competence didn't go unacknowledged. As we saw with Henry's proclamation that no one in Classroom 204 was in Spain, participants acknowledged the falseness created by certain task expectations. Indeed, even Ms. Mikes herself reminded students of this very candidly. For instance before students were about to begin a task that involved picking out different pieces of sentences at random (i.e. subject, verb, physical ailment), she offered this caveat:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
1	Ms. Mikes	Now because of the way we're doing this, these really aren't going to make very much sense, right, in terms of why. If she's cold, why does her shoulder hurt or something, I don't know, maybe she has arthritis. But don't worry about it, it doesn't have to make sense, we're just making three separate sentences. So if she is cold, how are we going to say that?

Ms. Mikes may have offered this piece of advice in order to prevent student distraction at nonsensical sentences; or, as her phrasing suggests, she may have done it to clarify that students need not become preoccupied that their sentences make sense. Regardless, this reminder acknowledged the unrealness of the nature of the language

competence that was being assessed in that moment, and oriented participants to what mattered for the task: That they produce three sentences.

Creativity as Competence

One morning in the early spring, students were learning some new grammar, including how to articulate in Spanish that an action was just completed (*acabar de*). After reading the explanation of *acabar de* from the textbook, Ms. Mikes directed the students to each come up with a sentence using *acabar*. Ms. Mikes emphasized that each sentence must be grammatically correct, but that students would vote on the most creative sentence, and the winner would get a *lempira*. Lempiras were the in-class currency in Classroom 204, and will be explained further below.

Students scrambled to write down their sentences, checking in with Ms. Mikes about certain issues to ensure that they had met the grammatically correct stipulation and then, one by one, they shared their products. Competence in this task was based not only on grammatical accuracy, as determined by Ms. Mikes, but on creativity, as determined by one's peers. The sentences varied in their interpretations of (and, arguably, success at) creativity: While Mary wrote about her dogs putting on make-up, and Quinn wrote about running with unicorns, Erica wrote about some kids who just ate pizza, and Cassandra actually re-used a sentence that the class had seen the day before (which we will see further below).

Before introducing her sentence, Kelsey attempted to boost its value:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
37	Kelsey	This is a true story, so I get extra points because it's true.
38	Ms. Mikes	Okay.
39	Ricky	This, mine's also true, so…

Here, it is unclear whether Kelsey and Ricky are appealing to Ms. Mikes, who typically is the language authority in their classroom, or to their peers, who will be voting. Regardless, both students are certainly claiming their sentences are valuable on the current market. Interestingly, the root of the value appears to be that the sentences are about actual events. The authentic inspiration for their sentences seems to be a selling point for Ricky and Kelsey, who are invested in earning their peers' votes. Bourdieu's (1992) explanation of this phenomenon is about less contrived exchanges, but it certainly applies here:

> Utterances receive their value… only in their relation to a market…. The value of the utterances depends on the relation of power that is concretely established between the speakers' linguistic competences, understood both as their capacity for appropriation and appreciation; it depends, in other words, on the capacity of the various agents involved in the exchange to impose the criteria of appreciation most favorable to their own products (p. 67).

The truth factor didn't help Kelsey's sentence about her mother serenading a stranger win the vote, although Ricky's sentence, which was about a friend crying after being hit by Ricky's younger brother, earned him a first place tie with Henry, whose sentence was about dreaming of cats.

In the next round, everyone was to write a sentence using the word "para (*in order to*)", which is the Spanish preposition used to indicate the purpose of an action. Students were told to base their sentences on the model offered in the text: "Tengo que levantarme

temprano para levantar pesas con Ana en el gimnasio (*I have to get up early in order to lift weights with Ana at the gym*)" (Humbach et al., 2006, p 240). While writing her sentence, Quinn asked Ms. Mikes a question regarding originality:

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Quinn	Can we say, like 'tengo que levantarme temprano para' blah blah?	Can we say, like 'I have to get up early to' blah blah?
2	Ms. Mikes	No, you have to write a totally original sentence.	
3	Quinn	Can we use 'tengo que'?	Can we use 'I have to'?
4	Ms. Mikes	Yeah.	

Ms. Mikes' attention to complete originality may have been, in part, a reaction to Cassandra's previous adoption of a sentence that wasn't actually hers. It also points to where creativity intersects with teacher motivation in scaffolding student language competence: An original sentence is one that pushes students to diverge from what they have read in their text, or heard at other points during class time. "Completely original," though, was easily deconstructed by Quinn in line 3: Students can't help but use words and phrases they have heard before, so the line between what "counts" as original and what is regurgitation was negotiated here between Quinn and Ms. Mikes.

Since Ricky and Henry had tied in the previous round for most creative sentence, all students wrote a sentence for the "para" round, but the only voting was to break the tie between the boys. Henry read his sentence first: "Tengo que ir a México para comprar los sombrero rojos (*I have to go to Mexico to buy the red sombreros*)". Ricky's sentence came next: "Tengo que maquillarme para hacer bonita y porque me gusta tacos (*I have to put on make up to make myself pretty and because I like tacos*)".

In this final face off, Henry won, but both boys employed some token cultural references, which may have been designed to boost their creativity factor. All of the sentences in the previous round had seemed culturally neutral within the context of Classroom 204, probably because they reflected students' mainstream Anglo-American culture. In the case of round two, however, both students in the running for the lempira added some cultural flair relevant to Spanish-speaking target communities beyond Classroom 204. There isn't enough data here to make a confident conclusion that this was anything more than coincidence, but it is worth pondering the notion that this may have been a choice on the boys' part. And, if it were a choice, it appears that the stereotypical artifacts of Mexican culture, such as sombreros and tacos, were employed in a way divorced from their real-world uses. These artifacts were made use of to boost academic standing, in such a way that converted the sombrero and the tacos into reified icons that carried value in Classroom 204 only because they were specters of authentic Mexican ways of doing. Once appropriated as they were, however, the authenticity became not Mexican, but specific to the way once-authentic things were handled in Classroom 204, although the boys introduced them under the guise of real-life Mexican authenticity. The section that follows further examines how different parts of Spanish language, and Latin cultures take on value specific to Classroom 204.

Spanish as Transactionally Valuable

There were near-constant instances in Classroom 204 in which students and teacher exchanged goods. These weren't typical transactions that involved money and material things, but exchanges of some demonstration of Spanish for some symbolic

token from the teacher that most often benefited student grades. My exploration of this facet of classroom happenings centers on the Spanish-like "goods" that students were in possession of, and the ways by which that ownership was emphasized.

The most basic of examples of this are the instances when Ms. Mikes offered, or students expected, extra credit for Spanish language goods that went beyond the classroom expectation. Part of the value associated with Spanish language goods centered, quite naturally, on the relevance they had in the classroom. Performing a song in Spanish at the school talent show would merit extra credit, for example; but when Quinn brought a funny Spanish-language video to Ms. Mikes' attention in hopes of receiving extra credit, she was unsuccessful. Various players' conceptions of what was relevant enough to warrant extra credit (or any type of credit) is telling, as it points to the boundaries that different participants perceived around the content most worthy of their Spanish language classroom. The discussion that follows considers the work that students did to ensure their production of Spanish earned them the most points possible.

The Various Angles to Grade-Bargaining

After a vocabulary quiz that involved some translation, Ricky, Cassandra, and Mary realized that they have mistranslated the sentence "These red pants don't fit me". While Ms. Mikes explained what was grammatically necessary for a correct translation, the three students responded in ways more oriented to their quiz grades:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
1	Ms. Mikes	You need this, this is exactly how this one needs to be. [*Some lines omitted for brevity of transcript*.] 'Cause otherwise it would be 'me quedo' here, but then this is the subject, which is why it has to be plural because it's pantalones that fit, but who do they fit, they fit me.

2	Cassandra	You shouldn’t count that one wrong.
3	Ricky	So I had everything right except that?
4	Mary	Can I give you some lempiras?
5	Ms. Mikes	Yeah.
6	Ricky	Like, I had, I had [that whole thing, but I had queda
7	Cassandra	[You shouldn’t count that one wrong.

While Ms. Mikes' explanation is abbreviated here, it was clearly oriented to student comprehension of why the right answer is grammatically sound. The students, however, were oriented to the grammatical accuracy only as it related to their grades. Cassandra, in repeating to Ms. Mikes that she shouldn't count that one wrong, may have been arguing that the grammatical complexity of the translation was beyond the expectation for the classroom. Her argument may also have been based on the fact that, before students handed in their quizzes, Ricky had asked Ms. Mikes a question about that sentence, and her answer unintentionally misled at least Ricky in his final answer. While Cassandra was hoping to break even based on Ms. Mikes not counting that item, Mary was offering lempiras to Ms. Mikes in order to bring up her quiz grade. Cassandra had lempiras too, but was likely hoping to hold onto them if she was able. Ricky's approach was more aligned with Ms. Mikes, in that he was assessing what he got correct, but he didn’t appear to be terribly focused on why, although he did state that "he gets it". After a couple of turns, in the continuation of this sequence, we see students further negotiate the link between their performance and their quiz grades, and Ms. Mikes responds to them with specific point values:

Line	**Speaker**	**Utterance**
15	Ms. Mikes	So you’re still better, you’re better to have put, at least now you’ve got the verb right, you just left off the who that it
16	Ricky	Well how many points would I have lost?

17	Ms. Mikes	One.
18	Ricky	Okay, and then
19	Cassandra	Um, what if you said ‘queda’ instead of ‘quedan’. One?
20	Ricky	Two more questions.
21	Ms. Mikes	Usually two on verb agreement, I’m (.5s inaudible).
22	Cassandra	Aggggh!
23	Ms. Mikes	Verb agreement is important to me.
24	Ricky	[Was ‘además’
25	Mary	[Can I give you two lempiras?
26	Ms. Mikes	Sí.

This is one example of many similar sequences that involve some type of direct discourse surrounding a concrete performance-point transaction. In line 23 in particular, we’re reminded that Ms. Mikes is the one establishing the point values (verb agreement not simply being important, but important to *her*). While this type of exchange about point value isn't necessarily unique to this classroom, or to FL classrooms, it sets us up to look deeper into the role that lempiras play in this particular FL classroom.

Lempiras

As mentioned above, lempiras were the currency of Classroom 204. Students were awarded color photocopies of Honduran play-money when they performed well in class and could later use them towards quiz and exam grades. A common phrase heard coming from all students in the class at the start of many competitions or whole-class activities was "is this for lempiras?" This question, which, like the age-old "is this for credit?" and "are we handing this in?" questions presumably points to students' orientations to the task, insofar as the potential pay-off (see Foley, 2010).

Below, in the midst of the competition that involved students writing creative sentences using the verb *acabar* (to have just done something), Cassandra was called on to share her sentence. Students would be voting on their favorites, and it had been established that the winner would receive a lempira:

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Ms. Mikes	Okay, lea, la primer- la, la mejor, Cassandra.	Okay, read the first, the the best, Cassandra.
2	Cassandra	My favorite? Uh, acabo de afeitarme la pantorilla.	My favorite? Uh, I just shaved my calf.
3	Ms. Mikes	Muy bien! That was my- mi frase! (*laughs*)	Very good! That was my- my sentence! (*laughs*)
4	Cassandra	I know (*laughs*)	
5	Ms. Mikes	Ah, Enrique	Um, Henry.
6	Henry	That one would not get the lempira.	

In lines 3 and 4, Ms. Mikes and Cassandra amusedly acknowledge that Cassandra has made use of the same exact sentence that Ms. Mikes herself used in a class activity the previous day. Ms. Mikes initially gives Cassandra a typical teacher evaluative response, before claiming Cassandra's sentence, submitted for voting that may win her a lempira, as her own. Clearly, this is not a serious case of plagiarism for Ms. Mikes, who appears amused at Cassandra's tactic in ensuring an acceptable sentence for her teacher. Henry, though, asserts that this sentence does not warrant a lempira, probably because the means by which it was produced doesn't qualify Cassandra as the rightful earner of any lempira associated with it, particularly because this was a part of the competition in creativity. Cassandra, too, is attuned to ownership of lempira-worthy sentences: In a pair activity in which Cassandra's group had acquired a point by writing a correct answer on a white board, Cassandra realized other groups hadn't yet completed their attempt, and

exclaimed to her peers "Erase! So no one cheats! Erase the verb!" guarding the key to the right answer by denying that piece of language to her rivals.

This type of assertion of ownership wasn't uncommon, and was typically playful but, as the course of the spring went on, the power of lempiras as money to be poured into student grades became more and more prevalent. This dynamic is outlined in the following section.

Lempiras as money.

Students were extremely focused on the value of lempiras, determining the most strategic ways to use them to boost their grades. Cassandra, for example, explained how, she "put two lempiras" on a recent quiz because "I didn't feel good about it... and that saved me from getting a C to a B, so I got an 80 instead of 78 and that was really lucky, I'm glad I did that". This points to the strategy that students had to employ in their use of lempiras: They couldn't add lempiras to quizzes and tests retroactively, but had to decide when they hand in the assessment, or soon thereafter, whether they wanted to add lempiras along with it. While this certainly avoided an influx of lempiras at the very end of an academic term, discouraged hoarding, and encouraged timely reflection on one's work, it also encouraged students to orient themselves to the mathematical tactics involved in spending their lempiras most effectively. Cassandra, for example, explained that she used them "no matter what on a test 'cause I always want extra points because the tests are worth more". It's not clear to me whether this strategy was actually sound, as it would depend on Ms. Mikes' point grading system, but Cassandra and Henry had

multiple debates about this during class, Henry often making jokingly exasperated statements such as "Are you understanding the mathematical concepts here?"

The staunch competition to acquire lempiras between the seven students in this class became quite intense toward the end of the spring term. Ms. Mikes actually explained to her class that she was feeling like competitions weren't fun anymore because of student obsession with lempiras, which, she reminded them, weren't the objective of the activities she plans. This classroom-economy, designed by Ms. Mikes to motivate students to participate in the socio-linguistic and academic happenings of her classroom, had slipped into the focal point for many (if not all) of this group of students. While the possibility of earning a lempira was meant to motivate students to engage in, or practice for, meaningful social acts within (or perhaps beyond) their classroom, students had become fixated on the money games they could play with the lempiras. In short, while lempiras were meant to encourage language use, they ended up distilling meaningful social acts for currency that very concretely contributes to one's academic standing in the class.

Kelsey: The top of the class.

When I first settled into my researcher role in the class, I was struck at the maturity and sophistication of the students in general. Kelsey had a particular assertion that I don't always see in eighth grade girls: She asked Ms. Mikes follow up questions about astute grammatical observations; she answered my informal interview questions with poise and detail; and she appeared to be direct and kind with her peers. By the time

I interviewed her individually, it came as no surprise to me that she asked me to ask Ms. Mikes what her current grade in Spanish was, and report back to her.

"You're sending me in as a mole?" I asked.

"Yeah," and she laughed, "I really want to know 'cause there's this like Spanish award at the end of the year... and it's between me and Cassandra".

There had been a mounting competition between Kelsey and Cassandra, mostly fueled by the former, which had actually culminated with the latter crying. Cassandra, it seemed, felt highly conflicted because she was unable to both do well in Spanish and make sure her friend Kelsey was happy. Apparently, it was all about this end of year award.

It wasn't until this same interview that I realized why Kelsey always asked to work alone in competitions. In a class of seven students, it wasn't uncommon that students would work in three pairs and one single team, if that single player preferred to work alone. Typically Kelsey asked whether she could work alone as soon as she realized there would be a competition. My previous assumption as to why had been accurate, but incomplete which, in Kelsey's words was that "I don't want to sound vain or anything... but just sometimes when I'm in a group and there's that one person who doesn't know, it just kind of bugs me, and so it's just easier". Apparently, though, the bigger reason for Kelsey, which she immediately disclosed to me once I asked her about her preference to work alone, was because if you compete alone in a game and win, you get "double lempiras". A capitalist move, it would seem, and one that drew Kelsey away

from engaging in the language with others, and towards making use of it to earn points. Kelsey was a master at maximizing profits in the Classroom 204 lempira economy.

When financial disaster hits.

One day in mid-spring, Kelsey shared with her classmates some crushing news: Her lempiras (between 10 and 40 of them, according to various estimates) had been stolen from her school locker. Students were outraged at this on Kelsey's behalf, thinking up plots to catch the culprit. Throughout the next few weeks, students made reports to one another about which of their peers from other classes they'd seen in possession of many lempiras. And someone, typically Ricky, would ask Ms. Mikes the relatively unsubtle question: "Does so-and-so win a lot of competitions?" to which Ms. Mikes typically diplomatically responded that it was conceivable that the potential culprit-of-the-day had acquired that many lempiras via honest means.

When their quest to find the thief didn't materialize, Kelsey's peers continued to show solidarity by suggesting that Ms. Mikes reimburse Kelsey. Mary, in her interview alongside Cassandra, explained that "we're still trying to get Señora Mikes to give [Kelsey] at least like three back because we feel like Señora Mikes knows that she had a lot, so she should at least get a couple back".

When asked about lempiras in an interview, Ricky and Henry first explained their general use, and then the topic turned to Kelsey's predicament:

Line	Speaker	Interview Transcript
1	Henry	…the one thing that Señora Mikes did that I didn't think was fair was that when Kelsey lost all her lempiras.
2	Ricky	Oh my God!
3	Henry	She didn't, she didn't like give any back, she was just kind of like 'tough,' even though that's 10 to 20 points on a test and

		that's kind of a big deal?

For the students, then, it seemed only fair that Kelsey be entitled to the lempiras she had earned. That is, it had less to do for them with the responsibility of holding onto them, or the unfairness that they had been stolen, and more to do with the reputation Kelsey had established as someone who possessed a lot of them. Bourdieu (1992) refers to this reputation as *political capital,* which, he explains, is "founded on *credence* or belief and *recognition* or, more precisely, on the innumerable operations of credit by which agents confer on a person… the very powers that they recognize in him" (p. 192, emphasis in original). The widespread knowledge that Kelsey had earned many lempiras had earned her political capital, and functioned as a kind of social insurance based on her academic (and probably social) standing in the class: If everyone knew that she had earned those extra points, it was their duty, as Kelsey's peers, to insist she be able to cash in, physical lempiras in hand or not.

Henry continued his above thought:

Line	**Speaker**	**Interview Transcript**
3	Henry	If somebody steals all of them, and she's like 'eh, whatever'. And so if that was me, you know, that wouldn't be cool. You know, I'd protest.
4	Ricky	Henry, you and I protest a lot this year in Spanish, I just noticed that.

And lo and behold, an organized protest occurred a week and a half later: Ricky counted to three at a pause in the lesson, and the room fell silent. Ricky popped up out of his seat and wrote and circled on the white board: "Give Kelsey's lempiras back." Ms. Mikes asked Ricky "If you're so concerned, why don't you give her some of your

lempiras?" And he gestured and mouthed back that he doesn't have any. Fair for Ms. Mikes was more of a laissez-faire approach, it would seem.

Over the course of that day's protest, the silent mode of communication prompted exchanges that weren't typical of the class. Students gradually acquired mini-white boards from the classroom cabinet, and used them to answer Ms. Mikes' class-related questions, as well as to state their cause. When Ms. Mikes told Quinn in Spanish that she liked her skirt, Quinn didn't skip a beat and, interrupting an answer she was writing on the class white board, wrote "gracias!", circled it, and continued with her answer.

As time went on, it became clear how intensely engaged each of the students was: They were multi-tasking between the classroom-prompts of Ms. Mikes and their cause. Kelsey's board read "Give me my lempiras," and Mary's "Give Kelsey her lempiras". As time passed, the messages morphed: Erica wrote "Give Kelsey's lempiras to ME!" and Cassandra "Fight the power, guys!". Kelsey erased her message, and attempted to re-write it in Spanish: "Usted me dame mis lempiras (*You to me give me my lempiras*)". Below this demand in parentheses was a nod to Ms. Mikes' continued role as teacher: Kelsey had written: "Is this right?". Ms. Mikes responded to the grammatical question, and Kelsey corrected her sentence.

Ricky and Henry both wrote: "I [heart] Sra. Mikes" on their boards, and Quinn jotted a note to let me know that she didn't think my audio-recorder was working (it was, but, given the circumstances, it probably wouldn't have mattered!). Soon before I stepped out of the classroom to do an interview, Erica added to her original message, so now it read "Give Kelsey her lempiras! Stop Kony!" Erica's second demand was a

reference to the Ugandan war criminal who was getting a lot of global attention during the weeks surrounding the protest in Classroom 204. On the way out of the door for our interview, Ms. Mikes told Mary and Cassandra to "please talk to Ms. Whitehead- she has nothing to do with the injustice that has been committed against you".

This protest, along with the class economy in general, pointed inward to the core of the classroom. The goals were within the classroom boundaries, as were the obstacles, and the victories (in which this protest did not culminate). And, within Classroom 204, we see students mobilize for a socially immediate purpose, in a cohesive organized way. While earning lempiras may have been equated with linguistic performance devoid of social purpose, the process of winning them back, subverted the very authority that typically doled them out. In other words, drawing briefly from Bourdieu and Wacquant's (1992) framework I outlined in Chapter 3, students overtook the field of their classroom for those twenty or thirty minutes: Their social imperative had emerged organically out of Ms. Mikes' "unfair" rule.

And this was, indeed a balancing act on the students' part: They knew that ultimately they weren't in charge, and thus they had to walk a fine, respectful line. Instead of refusing to work, students were as engaged and responsive as I had ever seen them. They simply were communicating through writing, which was not the mode of communication the class authority, Ms. Mikes, was employing or expecting her students to employ. Perhaps most interesting, then, is that the students' form of protest was to be *silent* in a class in which their authority was charged with teaching them a *language*. Bourdieu (1992) explains how "the power of a discourse depends less on its intrinsic

properties than on the mobilizing power it exercises" (p. 188). While writing is still a form of language, the silence was novel: The silence belonged to the students, and it thus came along with some reclaimed power (though no reclaimed lempiras).

So far, this chapter has focused on highly local manifestations of value in Classroom 204. Lempiras serve not only as a means to generate local notions value, but are undeniably concrete value in and of themselves: While Bourdieu's (1977, 1992) symbolic capital is certainly at play in this FL classroom, it is intertwined with actual tangible monetary capital in the form of lempiras. The immediacy of lempiras as a concrete token to reward and encourage certain classroom interactions may take the social authenticity out of those interactions themselves, but it does reaffirm the authenticity of the value market: Students are "doing" learning language in exchange for monetary reward and, in doing so, they continually reaffirm for themselves and their peers that the value attached to language acts in Classroom 204 were real, and could be counted in lempiras.

While lempiras certainly played a highly important role within the boundaries of Classroom 204, they didn't originate within that locale. The section that follows considers how lempiras were brought into the classroom from the outside world to establish the local economy, and how student participants understood that process.

The Origin of Lempiras

Lempiras, as mentioned above, were Honduran play-money that vaguely resembled actual legal Honduran currency. Ms. Mikes acquired them when she was in Honduras years before. Because students so comfortably used the term "lempira" in

reference to their specific classroom economy, I wondered about their understandings of how and why the lempira came into their class to begin with. Typically, when I asked students what lempiras were in interviews, I received information involving how they could be earned and spent within the classroom. I had to change my interview tactics a bit to explore students' awareness about where they actually originated. The following is an except from an interview between myself, Cassandra, and Mary:

Line	Speaker	Interview Transcript
1	Sarah	What do lempiras look like?
2	Cassandra	They're like fake Spanish money. I don't know where they're from, but…
3	Sarah	Are they from somewhere?
4	Mary	I think so, I think they're like fake.
5	Cassandra	I don't know which country, I think it's like it's somewhere Señora Mikes was when she went abroad. She's told us before, but I don't remember.
6	Sarah	It might be Honduras.
7	Cassandra	Yeah!
8	Mary	Yeah, Honduras.

Cassandra's use of the word "Spanish" in line 2 may indicate a blanket statement that all artifacts from Spanish-speaking locales might be characterized as "Spanish," but it might also be a reference to Cassandra's own Spanish language classroom. The word "fake" in this same line (and repeated again by Mary in line 4) highlights a strain between the concrete usefulness of lempiras within the classroom at hand, and the fact that they actually are fake money in the real world itself. Then, the various uses of the lempira are dependent on whether they are inside or outside of Classroom 204 and, without having referenced that factor to students, their descriptions of the lempira became somewhat ambiguous.

Interesting also is Cassandra's inclination to characterize lempiras based on where they're from: An indication that, for her, a money's origin is integral to understanding it, which speaks to a tacit awareness that money carries different values in different contexts. In line 5, Cassandra further specifies where she thinks them to be from, particularly in how they relate to Ms. Mikes' experiences, but the country itself isn't information that is readily available to Cassandra or Mary until I mention it, at which point, they both appear to recognize it as information they had once known. Henry and Ricky's interview took a similar route. They both initially claimed to not know what the word *lempira* meant until I suggested that it might be the name of a currency from somewhere:

Line	**Speaker**	**Interview Transcript**
1	Ricky	Oh yeah, I remember, it's like Honduras.
2	Henry	Yes, Honduras!
3	Ricky	Honduras!
4	Sarah	Honduras.
5	Henry	I think it's from Honduras, yeah.
6	Ricky	Yeah.
7	Sarah	Okay, cool. Do you know why Ms. Mikes picked that?
8	Henry	Because
9	Ricky	Oh, yeah (.5s inaudible)
10	Henry	In our old school
11	Sarah	What other school?
12	Henry	We were both her students in elementary school.
13	Sarah	Okay.
14	Henry	You know, from first through fifth grade we had her and then we came here and she also came here. But (*laughs*), but uh, back in those days, there was a big program at the school where some of the parents went to Honduras to help setting up schools and stuff like that and so then we would always like bring in stuff for Honduras and, Honduras stuff. And I think, I guess, lempira, and I think that's Honduras money. I'm not sure, I never checked.

Again, there is a real-world connection to Honduras- this one quite detailed and concrete, and that in and of itself appears to comprise relevance for the students: If people from Classroom 204 have had those experiences abroad, why *wouldn't* they have gathered together cultural goods there to repurpose in the Spanish classroom setting? There is no discussion about why it makes sense to have fake money from a Spanish-speaking country, and thus the relevance of authentic tokens seem to be taken for granted. The topic of relevance as it relates to authenticity of artifacts and language is an interesting one: The higher the authenticity of artifacts rises, the more relevance is taken for granted and unacknowledged by classroom players. This was a recurring dynamic in Classroom 204 that we will see throughout Chapter 8.

Because the word “lempira” was never translated, and lempiras were never referred to as anything else, one of my interview questions for Ricky and Henry was whether they knew where the word came from. They didn't. Henry weakly guessed "money?" followed immediately by "I don't know". The word's real-world meaning had gone unexamined, as they had adopted the term for the unique use it served in their class. The classroom boundaries altered the meaning of the lempira to the extent that it was essentially incidental that the fake lempiras looked vaguely like the real thing. Once adopted into Classroom 204, its characteristics that made it what it was in the real world fell apart, and new ones were assigned to it. This isn't surprising; it's how artifacts, and things, and language create and reflect situations. What is interesting, however, is the experienced-based relevance students attributed to the in-class lempira once asked about

it, although the in-class lempira was divorced from their origin in all of its other real-world intents and purposes.

In-class value and relatively short-term profits have been the topic of this chapter thus far. The next section focuses on student orientation to potential future pay-offs for knowing Spanish.

Rosetta Stone

While Rosetta Stone did not comprise any part of the curriculum of Classroom 204, it found its way into classroom discourse on a number of occasions, the most notable and prolonged of which was a discussion prompted by Mary. Interrupting a more traditional grammar lesson, Mary stated that she had a "quick question," and that she was thinking of starting Rosetta Stone on her own, and wanted to know if, in the classroom she and her peers were "learning more Latin American Spanish or Spain Spanish". I will refer to the five minute English-language discussion that followed as the *Rosetta Stone Discussion*. The transcript of the discussion in its entirety can be found in Appendix III.

Commodified Language

While considering how the Rosetta Stone Discussion sheds light upon what is constructed as valuable (or worth "having") in Classroom 204, I will also point out some more global issues surrounding the language-learning program itself. For instance, Rosetta Stone is a program that has packaged language in order to sell it: It has commodified language such that language learners using Rosetta Stone are also consumers. The language learner as consumer is a category that will weave its way throughout the discussion that follows. However, before continuing on along that vein, I

will take a brief step back to consider why, in the first place, Mary was expressing interest in the program.

That Mary not only was a potential consumer of language, but that she had actively sought out the Rosetta Stone program points not only to some presumed value in physically (or digitally) acquiring the program, but also to a presumed value in the knowledge that Mary might attain through the program. Sfard (1998) eloquently outlines some parallels between intellectual and material goods:

> If knowledge is conceived of as a commodity, it is only natural that attitudes toward learning reflect the way the given society thinks about material wealth. When figuratively equated, knowledge and material possessions are likely to play similar roles in establishing people's identities and in defining their social positions. In the class-ridden capitalist society, for example, knowledge understood as property is likely to turn into an additional attribute of position and power. Like material goods, knowledge has the permanent quality that makes the privileged position of its owner equally permanent (p. 8).

When asked about her out-of-class endeavors to learn Spanish with Rosetta Stone, Mary explained how it was actually her mother's idea: "I guess she wants to speed up the process so when I get to college she wants me to place out..." adding that doing so is "really hard". In other words, Mary's mother was attuned to the value that knowledge of the Spanish language could afford Mary as a college student, and to the potential practical, financial, and even prestigious pay-offs that knowledge may hold for Mary in the future.

Packaging Language

In order to package language to make it valuable, Rosetta Stone has had to categorize it, so that a consumer can chose which product they want: The categorization most pertinent to (and actually constitutive of) the Rosetta Stone discussion in classroom is the distinction between Latin American and "Spain Spanish", as Mary and a number of her peers put it.

It is important to note that Rosetta Stone has not created this distinction, but it is reflective of existing, wide-spread presumed categorization that allows consumers a choice. "The (standard) language construct," Train (2007) explains, "is basic to designing a marketable and exportable language for teaching to non-native speakers in imperial, colonial, and foreign contexts outside the nation-state of origin" (p. 212). The notion that "Spain Spanish" doesn't actually exist in practice as anything more than an idea is challenging for the layperson to grasp, likely due to Anderson's (1991) explanation that language is crucial to the notion of nationhood, and part of envisioning a nation is understanding a certain cohesive quality. Further, deconstructing the existence of "Spain Spanish" is likely irrelevant to the average language learner-consumer. On the other hand, Latin American Spanish can more easily be understood to draw upon countless varieties of Spanish precisely because "Latin America" is constituted by a large handful of countries: Packaging "Latin American Spanish" as a possible, feasible entity sends two tacit messages: First, that "Not-Spain" Spanish, as Quinn referred to it, exists because there are people who speak Spanish outside of Spain. This parallel is uncannily similar to the notion that that which lies beyond the western world can be classified as a

unitary, cohesive "non-West" (McCarthy, 1998, p. 43; see also Said 1993). Just as the "rest" of the world is a specter, so too is the notion of Latin American Spanish. "Not Peru Spanish" or "Not Costa Rica Spanish" are more blatantly arbitrary categories because they don't emerge as choices: This is wrapped up in geopolitical truths that merge a history of colonization with a perpetuating tendency to classify the colonized as a cohesive "rest".

The notion that Spanish fits into categories that are dependent, at least in part, on the Iberian variety, was not isolated to the Rosetta Stone discussion. Rather, categorizing Spanish based on whether or not it was from Spain was a rather common occurrence in Classroom 204. The short exchange below between Erica and Quinn happened during an interview about two months after the Rosetta Stone Discussion, after Quinn said that an online translating tool works well "for the Spanish we're learning".

Line	**Speaker**	**Interview Transcript**
1	Sarah	So, what's the Spanish that you're learning? How do you describe that?
2	Quinn	Like not Spain Spanish?
3	Erica	I think we are doing Spain?
4	Quinn	We're learning like
5	Erica	Cause don't they like, in Mexico they don't say 'vosotros'. In Spain they do.

In the section that follows, there is more focused analysis on the actual Rosetta Stone Discussion. Like the excerpt of the interview just above, we will see how *vosotros* is treated as a token of "Spain Spanish", and that the students in general were highly attuned to language varieties as categorical choices, while Ms. Mikes treated them more as varieties that, together, contribute to a well-rounded Spanish learner.

Latin America or Spain: I Mean, if You *Had* to Make the Choice

When Mary initiated the Rosetta Stone Discussion, she offered a choice. The ways by which different participants approached that choice become evident in the discourse that followed. To start, though, the conversation was quite centered on the either-or of Latin American or "Spain Spanish" that Rosetta Stone offers its potential consumers:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
1	Mary	Are we learning more Latin American Spanish or Spain Spanish?
2	Ms. Mikes	That's a good question. Um (5s). Yeah, I'm trying to, so there's two ways to answer it. I speak Spanish that's more Latin American Spanish so in one way, what you're learning about listening to me is that. On the other hand, I try and let you all know at any time when that varies significantly from the Spain Spanish, and then teach you that too. Right, so like what are some examples of that?
3	Henry	Vosotros!
4	Ms. Mikes	The vosotros form! So whenever I point that out and say 'Hey, where is this said?' it's so that you're learning both and I'm trying to teach you both, and I'm trying to point out 'Hey, if you go to Spain, you're going to want to know this vosotros form, but in Latin American and in the Spanish you're gonna hear me speak, you're not gonna hear that vosotros form.

In this exchange we see Ms. Mikes respond directly to Mary's question, not because she gives her a straightforward answer, which she doesn't, but because she offers her a response that fits within the two-choice frame that Mary offered. Ms. Mikes offers that her own Spanish is "more Latin American," but that she isn't exclusively teaching that, as indicated by Henry's ability to name one of the hallmarks of "Spain Spanish". At this point in the conversation, Ms. Mikes and Henry are on the same page, so to speak, insofar as the type of ideas that relate to Mary's choice: Ms. Mikes asked for a token,

concrete answer, Henry offered it, and Ms. Mikes not only accepts it with a "yes" or "okay" but emphatically confirms it by repeating (and even expanding on) Henry's answer. The *vosotros* form here acts as an indication of what category a token use Spanish might belong to. So, at first, Ms. Mikes works within Mary's frame to answer her question, not directly challenging Mary's given that there is an either-or choice to be made.

At the same time, early in the discussion, we see Ms. Mikes hint at deconstructing the choice in subtle ways. For instance, that she *doesn't* answer Mary's question with a simple answer of which version makes more sense to purchase and move back to the lesson at hand indicates that there is more to discuss and consider, as does the five second silence before she begins her answer. Further, even though she is referring to "both," and therefore, to at least some extent, adopting the categories Mary offered, her answer is that she, at once, is working to ensure that students are aware of variations well enough not only to name them, as Henry does in turn 3, but to be able to know (or at least comprehend) them "if [they] go to Spain". This answer, however, is not the one Mary needs to hear as a consumer who does, in fact, need to make a decision. Mary thus follows up Ms. Mikes' last turn above with a question that pushes for a more concrete choice:

Line	**Speaker**	**Utterance**
5	Mary	So, but we're mainly learning like Latin, like I know you're pointing out the Spanish or Spain stuff, but we're mainly learning the Latin American?
6	Ms. Mikes	I point it out 'cause I tend to speak Latin American Spanish, but in terms of the book, it tries to present-
7	Mary	Everything?
8	Ms. Mikes	No, it doesn't try to present everything but it tries to choose, I

		think, the most commonly understood.
9	Mary	Oh.
10	Ms. Mikes	So it tries to avoid words that would maybe only be used in Mexico or only be used in Spain, but that's not always successful, there's a lot of variation.

In short, Mary still doesn't get her answer. Note that she hasn't yet explained her reasoning for asking, which explains the rigidity of the answer she is seeking. Here, we see Ms. Mikes engaging in a discussion that, firstly, values those things that are "the most commonly understood" *across* categories and, secondly, points out that there is a fair amount of variation, even across Latin American countries, as implied by her choice to say "Mexico," instead of "Latin America".[7]

Throughout the conversation, the general proportion of student talk to teacher talk is roughly represented by the first excerpt above. Ms. Mikes seems to have a lot to say. It could be attributed to a number of things, including her having the "right" to the conversational floor as the teacher, and her having more expertise on the topic. While these two are likely contributing factors to the extent to which Ms. Mikes speaks during this conversation, a third contributing factor may be the difference in the types of information Ms. Mikes and her students are conveying. As seen in the above excerpt, the single student contribution after the question got asked was a one-word answer that was either right or wrong (in Henry's case, it was right). While Ms. Mikes certainly framed that contribution, wielding her conversational authority as the teacher, the trend continues

[7] It may seem like I'm jumping here, and missing the possibility that Ms. Mikes may be equating Mexican Spanish with Latin American Spanish. Because of parts of the Rosetta Stone transcript not included here, as well as other transcripts, I can reassure the reader that this was not something Ms. Mikes was (even unintentionally) doing.

throughout, and as the discussion unfolds, students and Ms. Mikes appear to be grappling over what type of information constitutes an acceptable answer to Mary's initial question:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
11	Ms. Mikes	…within your question (…) for people who are educated (…) the difference is not that much greater than the difference between, you know, British English or Australian English or U.S. English, right, so you just learn English that might mean when you go to Britain you're going to come up against words you're not familiar with.
12	Henry	Like monkey nut!
13	Ms. Mikes	Like- (*laugh*)
14	Henry	That's peanut.
15	Ms. Mikes	That's what they call monkey nut?
16	Henry	Peanut in Britain is a monkey nut.
17	Erica	Fish and chips.
18	Ms. Mikes	Or chips are fries, but, so, is that gonna mean that you can't communicate in Britain? No, so it's the same. Like whatever Spanish you're learning when, if you go to Spain you're going to come across words that you never learned in your Spanish class but you're still generally gonna be able to understand everything they say and they'll be able to understand everything you say (…)

Here we see similar types of short, factual information offered up by both Henry and Erica not because they were prompted, but it seems this type of token information is how they're oriented to the conversation, whereas Ms. Mikes has begun deconstructing Mary's question, which is based on the false categories that emerge out of geopolitical norms, and instead is showing an orientation to the value inherent in understanding others and being understood. It is this divide- the pull between the students as category-driven, and the push of Ms. Mikes to assert more vague categories (such as 'commonly understood') that illuminates the different orientations that students and teacher have to what holds communicative value.

The excerpt that follows comes just after Ms. Mikes' turn in line 18 above, and is the first time Mary establishes that she is asking because of Rosetta Stone:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
19	Mary	I was looking at Rosetta Stone and I wanted to like see like the Spanish stuff.
20	Ms. Mikes	Oh yeah.
21	Mary	And I was going on Spanish but they were like 'You wanna learn Latin American Spanish or Spain Spanish?'
22	Ms. Mikes	Yeah (…) there's always gonna be (…) different words (…) and accent variation so maybe the things that you'd be listening to would be if you chose Spain Spanish, they would choose, that would be the main accent that you'd hear is the Spain Spanish.
23	Ricky	Would you do Latin American Spanish?
24	Henry	I mean if you had to make the choice it'd probably be Latin America- I mean cause they're right there.
25	Ms. Mikes	Or I would maybe chose sometimes this and sometime can you switch back and forth day by day.
26	Mary	You have to go on different, like, levels.
27	Ms. Mikes	Oh, ok. I mean I would probably chose Latin American 'cause it's much more likely living in Texas you're going to encounter Latin American Spanish and Latin American speakers.

Akin to Ms. Mikes' earlier value assigned to that which is "most commonly understood," she side-steps Mary's question one last time in line 25 above to see if Mary can "switch back and forth day by day," indicating that well-roundedness may be more covetable than becoming exclusively masterful of one (see Kramsch 1997). Again, for Ms. Mikes value is assigned to being able to survive communicatively in as wide a variety of contexts as possible; it is not attached to a consumer lens of having to make choices, and it is not focused on passing out of Spanish in college. With the help of Ricky and Henry, who offer their two cents, Mary finally gets her answer out of Ms. Mikes. It turns out the question that she had originally posed in line 1 ("which Spanish

are we learning?") pushed Ms. Mikes in the direction of describing language, but when pushed to actually make a choice between the two Rosetta Stone products, she was willing to assert the more likely option she herself would chose, were she a Rosetta Stone consumer.

Still, After saying that she would likely select Latin American Spanish because it is more likely in the southwestern United States to come across that variety (those varieties) of Spanish, Ms. Mikes reverts back to her original description, reasserting that: "it's not like choosing a different language like 'Oh my gosh, what do I chose Spain or Latin America?' It's not really going to matter, you're going to learn Spanish, either way it's not going to cause you problems". In other words, Ms. Mikes is denying the idea that there really is a choice in the world of Spanish speakers. Mary may have a choice to make as a consumer, but that choice isn't going to yield subsequent problems, as the choice itself is based on a distinction that does not soundly represent language in use. Mary's ownership of the Rosetta Stone program won't ensure command of the language beyond the computer program itself, but whatever knowledge she does glean from the program will hopefully contribute to that which Ms. Mikes values: mutual comprehensibility beyond the classroom.

Boundary-Making as a Tug of War: Bringing it in, or Keeping it out

A couple of months later, when I asked her about Ms. Mikes' response to her question about Rosetta Stone, Mary recapped Ms. Mikes' contribution as follows:

Line	Speaker	Interview Transcript
1	Mary	She said we kind of use both but I think that she didn't really give me an answer. She just said she's teaching us both so wherever we go we'll be able to use a different type of Spanish.

		So I guess she didn't really give me an answer but I figured there's more likely a chance I'll go to Mexico or South America than to Spain, so I'm learning the Latin American one.

Mary's logic here, rather than being wrapped up in which might pay off come college, is based largely on location. It's unclear as to whether Mary adopted Ms. Mikes' stance that it makes more sense to speak the Spanish that more closely represents the speakers who are (or are likely to be) in closest proximity or if she came to that conclusion independently. It appears that likely proximity to where Spanish is spoken was a key criterion for both Ms. Mikes and at least some of her students in considering what varieties of Spanish will be most useful. This is hardly surprising, but it is important, because it serves as a middle-ground that emerges out of the back and forth of students wanting a definitive answer and Ms. Mikes not immediately giving it.

Stating that, if pressed, she would probably choose Latin American Spanish, Ms. Mikes projected student Spanish use into a hypothetical future. Her orientation to the discussion was not about language use in Classroom 204, but about mutual comprehensibility if and when the time came that students use language beyond the classroom. In this sense, Ms. Mikes was keeping the real world language distant, outside of the classroom, poised to come alive in the future. This may appear a critique of Ms. Mikes, but it is actually the opposite: Real-world language resides in the real world and, by keeping it distant, Ms. Mikes was arguably keeping it intact. She was avoiding what happens when we bring it in, distill it to factual information that highlights tokens of difference (e.g. vosotros and monkey nut), and ultimately categorize it in ways that deny its real world richness.

For consumers, the choice between Latin American and Spain Spanish likely distracts from the fact that neither variety of Spanish exists in practice- both are ideas. None of this matters to consumers, because marketability isn't predicated on the existence of things for sale, but the concrete packaging of them so that they might be sold. In essence, then, the Spanish language becomes reified in a number of ways as it gets closer to the thresholds of FL classrooms (or, perhaps, closer to Mary's home computer). Ahmed (2000) points out that it is actually the process of creating proximity that solidifies and fossilizes detached understandings from elsewhere and converts them into objects of value.

Still, Mary as a consumer of the Rosetta Stone program, was able to come to the same conclusion as Ms. Mikes, from a different angle: That, presuming Rosetta Stone will help her acquire skills to communicate in Spanish, it makes the most sense to purchase the version that is more represented in the southwestern U.S. In other words, a boundary appears to have been negotiated: In the classroom, the students' expectation appeared to be that "the Spanish we're learning" ought to be definable. Ms. Mikes resisted this, because beyond the classroom, language is not definable in the ways students are asking. But, it appears, for the sake of language learners who needed some type of general definition, for whatever reason, all parties in this classroom agreed that it made sense to use the most local varieties as models for preparation, should they have to choose. This agreement didn't resolve the discussion entirely, but it emerged as the fault line between where and how teacher and students see language (including future language) as happening.

Conclusion

This chapter has tied the construct of value to the construct of authenticity, as they manifest themselves in Classroom 204. While the in-class economy of Classroom 204 may have encouraged inauthentic, performative displays of language from the students, the same economy was immediately meaningful to students, and thus events such as their silent protest carried socially authentic weight. The Rosetta Stone Discussion offers insight into how students value and draw boundaries around the versions of Spanish that they have the opportunity to learn, and highlights the challenges that confront students in conceiving of their imagined futures of Spanish use.

Chapter 8, is the final findings chapter. Having addressed the construct of authenticity in Chapters 5 and 6, and the construct of value in Chapter 7, the final chapter merges analysis of the two constructs. Attention is paid to the ways by which students establish proximity to the authenticities of the real world beyond their classroom and how, in doing so, they accrue symbolic capital within the walls of their classroom.

CHAPTER 8

BRINGING THE OUTSIDE IN

In Classroom 204, the types of additional information that appeared to be most valuable and relevant pertained to Spanish in its real-world context. While this may appear obvious, contrasting it with textbook knowledge (or, what VanLier, 2011, characterizes as "test-compatible language, far from real-life but close to the grade") makes it particularly clear that in Classroom 204 it is specifically non-textbook knowledge that jumped out as relevant to both students and teachers alike. Students never appeared to strive to prove mastery of vocabulary and grammar *except* when they were being formally assessed on it (and, arguably, any attempt to do so when it didn't affect their grade may have caused their social capital to plummet) (p. 35). So, there was a system of requests for and displays of textbook knowledge in Classroom 204 that was much like any classroom; beyond that, much student-initiated and student-propelled talk was centered around what things are like beyond the classroom, and certain focus was lent to which students were able to bring that information in.

This is the final findings chapter. It focuses on the ways by which students assert proximity to various forms of real-world knowledge. To do this, I begin with Schumann's (1978) notion of social proximity, outlined in Chapter 2. Unlike Schumann, I don't use this construct to gauge student language progress, but to simply gain an understanding of where and how they position themselves with respect to the real-world stuff that relates to their in-class curriculum. The sections that follow review tactics that students used to negotiate their identity as knowers in the classroom.

Basic Ways of Indexing Closeness

The type of information that students chose to bring into Classroom 204 bolstered not only their status as *knowers* of real-world Spanish-related things, but often their status as people who participated in or witnessed such things. Academic (and social) capital in Classroom 204 was built in part upon student proximity to the non-textbook knowledge of which they spoke. By indexing closeness to real-world Spanish in ways that were credible to their peers and teacher, students placed themselves along a spectrum between textbook knowledge, firmly rooted in Classroom 204, and real-life experiences which stretched to various (sometimes imagined) locales beyond the classroom's walls.

Perhaps the most obvious instances in which students brought in information from beyond the classroom was when they were citing their real-life experiences with Spanish. Typically these real life experiences fell into two categories, both of which speak to the privilege of the Classroom 204 population: Travel abroad, and interactions with domestic help. The discussion that follows outlines three ways by which students in Classroom 204 asserted expertise of the material, specifically relating to real-world manifestations of language and culture.

Corroboration

Kelsey had the most travel experience in Spanish speaking countries of her peers, though many of the students had vacationed in Mexico or Costa Rica. Kelsey was the most likely of her peers to explain her experiences abroad, usually in connection to the lesson at hand. For instance, in the excerpt below, she corroborated Ms. Mikes'

grammatical explanation of the verb "to cost" by connecting it to her real-world experience:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
1	Ms. Mikes	Now, there's really only two forms of it that we use very often. right? 'Cause you don't usually talk about 'I cost' or 'you cost'. It's usually a thing that costs, and so it's usually either just *cuesta* or *cuestan*.
2	Kelsey	I remember that, like when I went, like, to Peru and Spain like the only Spanish I knew was like 'cuánto cuesta'.
3	Ms. Mikes	Cúanto cuesta- exacto! Yes! How much does it cost? And so it'd be 'cuesta' if it's one thing. Right?

In line 2 above, Kelsey not only corroborates Ms. Mikes' grammar information by confirming that she had experienced this use of language, but she adds information, actually offering the phrase "How much does it cost?" This additional information serves two purposes. The first is that it bolsters Kelsey's credibility: Claiming first-hand experience with the stuff of the curriculum is easy; offering up information that Ms. Mikes then corroborates in line 3 serves Kelsey's status as a knower inside her classroom. The second is that, in offering additional information, Kelsey side-steps the socially risky act of claiming she already knew about *costar* without having anything else to offer. On a more theoretical level, Kelsey is bringing her experiences from the real world into the grammar lesson. She does so by not only projecting herself to situations beyond the classroom (that her peers have to imagine), but by connecting those experiences to points of interest local to Classroom 204. I include this example of student corroboration here not only as a concrete way-in to the analysis that follows, but to point out that real-life citations such as this were consistently treated as relevant by Ms. Mikes. Students were never told to wait to share. Their contributions appeared to lend credibility to the

curriculum and were thus embraced as fully relevant without any exception that I witnessed. In ecological terms, this is a good example of various entities having found a mutually-beneficial good fit: Kelsey was able to assert her expertise, and Ms. Mikes was able to accept real-life experience into her curriculum, which, in turn, likely bolstered credibility and interest levels for her other students.

(Pop) Cultural Literacy

Ms. Mikes was introducing *Camisa Negra*, a popular song by Juanes, when Cassandra expressed excitement, bringing it to the attention of her class that she was already familiar with the song:

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Ms. Mikes	Esta es la, una canción de Juanes. Do y'all know [Cassandra: Juanes?!], have you heard of Juanes before?	This is the, a song by Juanes. Do y'all know [Cassandra: Juanes?!], have you heard of Juanes before?
2	Cassandra	(Gasps) *¿Camisa Negra?*	(title of song)
3	Ms. Mikes	Exacto! How do you know *Camisa neg-*	Exactly! How do you know *Camisa neg-*
4	Cassandra	Mi, mi canción favorito de español!	My, my favorite Spanish song!
5	Ms. Mikes	¿Sí?	Yeah?
6	Cassandra	¡Sí!	Yeah!

While above we saw Kelsey's credibility bolstered by her ability to elaborate on what Ms. Mikes was describing, here Cassandra's expertise became credible because she was able to preemptively name the song, thus denying others any opportunity to question her familiarity with it. I think of this as one of a handful of hoops that Cassandra jumped through in order to prove her pop-culture literacy in this particular exchange. She herself constructed the first hoop, beating Ms. Mikes to the punch in naming the song. Ms.

Mikes holds up the second hoop in line 3, asking Cassandra about her experience with the song. This request for information is another form of how student real-worldliness is constructed as relevant within the classroom. While Cassandra responds to this question in line 4, she doesn't actually answer it, but more specifically indexes her relationship with this song. Ms. Mikes seems interested in a direct answer, and thus repeats the question in line 7, which follows:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
7	Ms. Mikes	How do you know *Camisa negra*? No other students have known this.
8	Cassandra	Really? Um, I don't...
9	Ms. Mikes	It's just something that you've heard in life?
10	Cassandra	Um, I think my babysitter showed it to me when [Ms. Mikes: Ahh] I was like six.
11	Ms. Mikes	Okay. Muy bien.

While Ms. Mikes was certainly not challenging Cassandra's claim to knowledge, the opportunity she gives Cassandra to further specify the nature of her knowledge urges her to jump through the second hoop of proof. While Cassandra initially doesn't have a specific answer to offer (line 8), and Ms. Mikes offers her a way out in line 9, Cassandra ultimately cites her Spanish-speaking babysitter as the source, which appears to sate Ms. Mikes' curiosity about how Cassandra came across this song. Ricky, in the line that follows, holds up the third hoop of proof, undoubtedly the most daunting of the three:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
12	Ricky	How does it go? How does it go?
13	Cassandra	It's like, ah, 'tengo la camisa negra...' (*speaks in song's rhythm*)
14	Ricky	Oh, I know this.
15	Erica	Sí.
16	Cassandra	And I don't know all the words, but...

Interestingly, Ricky's prompt for Cassandra in line 12 appears to be functioning for him as less of a challenge (which is likely how it felt to Cassandra), and more of an opportunity to also claim knowledge of this song, which both he and Erica do in lines 14 and 15 respectively. Cassandra, focused on proving her knowledge, offers a limit to her expertise in line 16, as students begin to chat about their knowledge of the song, which Ms. Mikes ultimately stops so that she may continue with the introduction.

E. D. Hirsch (1988) coined the term *Cultural Literacy* to refer to the knowledge and concepts that all successful students in U.S. schools ought to know. Further, Hirsch (2006) warns that dilution of cultural knowledge among American students results in social divides between those who know and those who do not. While the notion of cultural literacy is often condemned as a prescriptivist call to action, entrenched in white, classist epistemologies (see McCarthy 1997, p. 112), not to mention based on a banking notion of learning that disregards constructivism (see Freire 1970, Chapter 2), we see the social capital that comes along with certain (pop) culture literacies playing out in Classroom 204. While Hirsch's solution to the disparity in cultural knowledge between different student demographics is ill-informed, the data here indicates that culturally-relevant bits and pieces of knowledge bolster symbolic capital.

Face-work

Face-work, a term coined by Erving Goffman (1955), refers to interactional negotiation that either rectifies or avoids situations that may cause social actors to lose face (i.e. to feel shame or embarrassment). Shame researcher Brené Brown (2008, Chapter 4) notes the feelings of inadequacy that are likely to come up for many people if

they lack of certain types of knowledge; people may engage in face-work in order to avoid or respond to that shame. This section considers the ways in which students in Classroom 204 engage in face-work that relates to preserving their statuses as knowers in Classroom 204.

Hot potato: When losing face isn't a threat.

There were a number of vocabulary games in Classroom 204 that sparked barrages of student guesses about what various Spanish terms meant. For example, students were collectively stumped about what the word *sentir* (to feel) meant when they were playing a form of "Hot Potato" that included vocabulary translation. One student after another translated incorrectly (and was thus out of the running for a lempira) but all of them were aware that the verb they were guessing at related somehow to the Spanish way of saying "I'm sorry". Their many answers included: to ask forgiveness, to apologize, to forgive, to say you're sorry, I'm sorry, to be sorry, to be sorry for, to excuse yourself, to cry, to be regretful, to show regret. The wrong guesses came rapidly, and students appeared tense, but amused.

It appears that students felt comfortable making guesses that were downright wrong, so long as they were educated guesses. The payoff was a lempira, and thus students had something to gain, and seemingly little to lose in making an inaccurate attempt at an answer. The time pressure involved in Hot Potato likely contributed to the acceptability of wrong answers, as was the fact that the game wouldn't be fun, if everyone got everything right. The game *depended* on some wrong answers. Perhaps most importantly, students wouldn't lose face by claiming they knew some type of extra

(outside-the-classroom) knowledge and then not following through. The knowledge they needed to display here was invariably tied to their student textbook. When the nature of the knowledge in question related to Spanish in the real-world context, however, it appears that establishing affiliation with the knowledge became more of a high-stakes activity because achieving that affiliation meant gaining social (and academic) capital, while attempting to achieve it and failing was a way to lose face.

Talking about the real world: Topics beyond hot potato.

FL students not having the (pop) cultural literacy to identify *Camisa negra* may not be shaming, because it is not expected of them; certain types of information, however, may feel more perilous insofar as the potential to lose face. While there wasn't one central example in Classroom 204, a number of themes emerged out of discussions that involved talk about how things are in the Spanish-speaking world. The following section illustrates how students negotiated the line between asserting some expertise in real-world Spanish (and related things), while at once protecting themselves from being discredited. While the tactics that students used are identifiable throughout much of the data, I focus specifically on two conversations to illustrate my findings.

What is* el cinco de mayo*?

When students were asked on the Monday after *El cinco de mayo* what it is, they weren't able to offer an accurate answer. "You guys are not in the minority here," reassured Ms. Mikes who went on to explain that it is a celebration of a battle won against Napoleon's army in the Mexican town of Puebla. Ms. Mikes helped students to save face when she told them they weren't alone. Unlike her strong "No!" that followed

all of the wrong Hot Potato answers, her response to her students here was gentle, ensuring that their lack of cultural knowledge wasn't a shameful inadequacy. Still, even within this relatively safe setting that Ms. Mikes created in Classroom 204, students answered her initial question about what *el cinco de mayo* is with caution. Not a single student answered her question correctly and yet not a single one simply said "I don't know". Below, we see how Quinn and Henry responded to Ms. Mikes' question:

Line	**Speaker**	**Utterance**
1	Ms. Mikes	What is the *cinco de mayo?*
2	Henry	¡Cinco de mayo! (*announcer voice*)
3	Ms. Mikes	Sí.
4	Quinn	Mexican independence
5	Henry	No, it's not
6	Quinn	Just kidding

The two tactics we see here from Henry and Quinn are at opposite ends of the caution spectrum. In line 2, Henry simply repeats part of Ms. Mikes' question, inserting himself into the conversation, but not even venturing an answer. Further, he does so with a highly impressive announcer-like voice that he often takes on in situations when he appears to be trying to assert some type of expertise. Quinn, on the other hand, offers perhaps the most predictable answer in line 4, which sets her up to lose face. Unlike Henry's proactive tactic to save face, Quinn's tactic in line 6 is responsive, and serves to help her regain face. "Just kidding" might indicate a retraction of her answer or a claim that she was actually making a joke. Later in the conversation, Quinn further distances herself from her initial answer, explaining "that's what my mom told me it was". Also notable here is Henry's evaluative role in line 5. He is claiming expertise by rejecting Quinn's answer, but is not able or willing to venture one himself.

The next series of examples examines further student tactics in avoiding or repairing wrong answers, before looking at some more complex discourse tactics by Kelsey in establishing some real-world knowledge based on her experience abroad.

Carne guisada, siestas, and lisps.

When reviewing the lyrics to the song *No hago más na'* by the Puerto Rican music group *El gran combo*, students arrived at the line "Yo me como un buen almuerzo de arroz con habichuelas y carne guisada (*I eat myself a good lunch of rice and beans and* carne guisada)". Erica was translating the line, and paused at *carne guisada*, unsure of the translation:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
1	Erica	I don't know what that is
2	Ms. Mikes	No, you've never tried that? It's a very popular dish. You can get it at any Mexican restaurant, it's kind of like meat, like beef?
3	Erica	Is it fajita meat?
4	Cassandra	What is it?
5	Ms. Mikes	No, it's more like stew meat, so it's a meat that's been cooked really slowly in like a gravy kind of sauce.

Here, we see Erica openly admit she doesn't know something in line 1. Perhaps this is less shameful to not know than not knowing about *el cinco de mayo*: After all, *everyone* celebrates *el cinco de mayo*, but *carne guisada* appears not to have reached the same cultural trendiness. Interesting in this exchange are the differences in how Erica and Cassandra manage their lack of knowledge. While Erica asks outright in line 3 whether *carne guisada* is fajita meat, which invites a definitive negative response from Ms. Mikes in line 5, Cassandra asks an open-ended question that indicates curiosity. Neither of the students appears to be asserting knowledge of this type of meat, but they

do seem to be approaching the discussion from different angles. While Erica appears to be guessing in the fashion of a vocabulary game, where wrong answers are okay, Cassandra appears more prudent, avoiding a negative response, and framing her question not as one that is met with a teacher evaluation, but as one whose answer will come along with information about the Spanish-speaking world.

After a bit of talk about *carne guisada*, Ms. Mikes asks a question about cultural norms:

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
17	Ms. Mikes	Why would he be eating carne guisada, arroz, y habichuelas at the almuerzo?	Why would he be eating carne guisada, rice, and beans for lunch?
18	Kelsey	'Cause, oh 'cause, um, don't they eat like bigger lunches and then take a long nap and like a late dinner?	
19	Ms. Mikes	Exacto.	Exactly.

Firstly, it's arguable that Ms. Mikes' question is contrived here: There is nothing inherently bigger about the lunch described in the song than what would be expected in the U.S. In asking the question, however, she is getting at a piece of cultural information that, if students are privy to it, they are able to display their knowledge, which is exactly what Kelsey does. Kelsey's tendency in establishing knowledge of the Spanish-speaking world tends to be that she reports norms in a matter-of-fact manner. In line 18 above, she delivers her matter-of-fact answer in the form of a question, couching her expertise in student-like language. Below, Ms. Mikes continues the explanation:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
20	Ms. Mikes	Traditionally, the main meal, traditionally our main meal like our meat and potato and vegetable is dinner, right? Traditionally, in Latin countries the main meat potato

		vegetable, the big, heaviest meal of the day is lunch.
21	Kelsey	I remember that like you can't shop like at all during the afternoon.
22	Ricky	That'd be so cool. I'd love to do that.
23	Kelsey	'Cause they're all siesta-ing
24	Ms. Mikes	Yeah
25	Cassandra	Don't they, like, all leave school and like take a nap or something?
26	Ms. Mikes	Um, traditionally, yes.

Ms. Mikes' explanation in line 20 somewhat resembles Kelsey's in the excerpt above in that it avoids overgeneralizations, by including qualifiers ("like" and "bigger" for Kelsey; "traditionally" for Ms. Mikes), and by avoiding words like "everyone" or "always". It seems as if Ms. Mikes may be modeling responsible culture-talk behavior for her students, while Kelsey may be avoiding answers that are so specific that they can be thoroughly wrong. Cassandra, too, in line 25 phrases her question so that a negative evaluation by Ms. Mikes could conversation-analytically be a preferred response (i.e. "yes, they do not to that"). Her qualifier "or something" functions also to avoid giving an answer that could feasibly receive a blanket "no" as an evaluation.

In re-inserting herself in the explanation in line 21, Kelsey claims some authority around the issue by directly referencing her own experience which, as mentioned above, is invariably treated as a relevant, credible, and interesting source of student information. In citing a memory, Kelsey appears to free herself of needing to qualify or cushion her explanations against a negative response. She takes further ownership of her remembered experience by using the term "siesta-ing," a modified loan word ostensibly of her own creation.

Like we saw in Chapter 7, Kelsey's drive to accrue academic capital often surpasses that of her peers. While Kelsey constructs an identity for herself not as an insider, but as a knowledgeable observer of Latin culture, it appears that Ricky is content in line 22 above to imagine what such a routine would be like for himself. Kelsey's is much more driven to construct credibility for herself in this type of discussion, and at times, we see her challenged by Ms. Mikes. The following excerpt was part of The Rosetta Stone Discussion, which was analyzed in Chapter 7:

Line	**Speaker**	**Utterance**
29	Quinn	So Spain people, they'd still be able to understand us?
30	Ms. Mikes	Yes.
31	Kelsey	No, it was confusing when I was there. 'Cause I'd be like saying something that would be right but then they'd be like 'what?' and then they'd say things that I didn't under-
32	Ms. Mikes	And that's gonna be true anywhere you go because you're still learning the language.
33	Kelsey	And they all have like weird like, they talk like super fast and have they have like weird lisps, but I didn't-
34	Ms. Mikes	They don't have weird lisps. They have a different accent.
35	Kelsey	Yeah. It's like a different kinda thing.
36	Ms. Mikes	Right.

Here, in line 31, Kelsey is once again drawing upon her experience but, unlike the previous examples, she has blatantly challenged Ms. Mikes' answer in line 30. While Kelsey's experience is still treated as valuable, Ms. Mikes contextualizes it by explaining how Kelsey's student status contributed to her interactional challenges while in Spain while at once gently re-claiming her own status as the authority on the issue. Kelsey, though, in line 33, continues to add to her initial narrative. She doesn't argue with Ms. Mikes in this case (she uses "and" instead of "no"), but simply continues to characterize

the speakers she came into contact with. Unlike her explanations above, the one in line 33 is riddled with subjective (arguably judgmental) language, namely the word "weird," which Ms. Mikes pushes back on in line 6. She rephrases Kelsey's observation, again, embracing the take-away but negotiating with her on the way it is delivered. Kelsey's utterance in line 7 finally wins Ms. Mikes' approval: Kelsey agrees with Ms. Mikes, which allows her to maintain that she too has some authority on the issue, and offers a vague take-away that, as we saw with Cassandra's "or something" above, is hard to argue with. In other words, the participants in these examples have negotiated a mutually-beneficial good fit: Kelsey and Cassandra work at getting validated by Ms. Mikes, and Ms. Mikes is able to establish some expectations about how absent groups of people are talked about.

This section has attempted to outline the ways by which students engage in face-work around real-world information that they aren't expected to know as Spanish students, but that appears to bolster their in-class symbolic capital nonetheless. The section that follows focuses on what "counted" as knowledge worth demonstrating in Classroom 204. While the discussion ultimately turns back to authenticity, it will begin by considering the draw of information that is not necessarily student-appropriate.

Knowing What You're Not Supposed To

As noted above, in Classroom 204 students often corroborated (or challenged) Ms. Mikes' accounts based on their own real-world information. While this type of knowledge wasn't assessed, and was not expected of students, it was celebrated when it was introduced. On the other hand, there were also many instances in which student

knowledge was not necessarily school-appropriate, but also celebrated by the very virtue that it constituted real-world language.

The students were particularly taken with the term *mierda* ("shit") that was introduced during their work with the song *La camisa negra* by Juanes. Juanes actually uses the word *miércoles* ("Wednesday") instead of the actual swear word, which in Spanish is a common side-step to using the word without actually saying it. Given the real-world relevance of this phenomenon (much like saying "sugar" in English instead of "shit"), Ms. Mikes explained it to the class. The students who were present were, unsurprisingly, exceedingly attentive. A couple of days later when Ms. Mikes' supervisor came to observe, the song was part of the day's lesson, and while Ms. Mikes was preparing to play the audio, the following exchange happened:

Line	**Speaker**	**Actual Utterance**	**English Translation**
1	Ricky	This has some bad words in it.	
2	Kelsey	(Exasperated breath)	
3	Ms. Mikes	Shhh!	
4	Kelsey	Ricky!	
5	(laughter)		
6	Ms. Mikes	[No le digas que les estoy enseñando palabras malas!	Don't tell her I'm teaching you bad words!
7	Kelsey	[The principal is in the room.	
8	Quinn	No, it doesn't. It almost has a bad word, but it doesn't.	
9	Ricky	It says 'baby' in it, that's not a nice word.	
10	Ms. Mikes	It- (laughs)	
11	Kelsey	No, it says, like it says like (1s)	
12	Henry	Miércoles!	
13	Ms. Mikes	Okay, aquí vamos.	Okay, here we go.
14	Kelsey	Yeah, miércoles (laughs). That's what it was.	

The field notes that correspond with this transcript were crucial to helping me interpret it, namely in determining whether participants appeared amused or uncomfortable. Based on my field notes, all participants appeared to see humor in this situation, with Quinn's contribution in line 8 being the single case when I was unable to discern whether she was making this clarification to assert her knowledge (and correct Ricky), or to protect Ms. Mikes from a potential misunderstanding by her supervisor.

Ricky's utterance in line 9 appears to be a cover-up of sorts, but it comes out after the song that he is unsure what the bad word is. ("Where were you?" asked Mary, somewhat incredulous.) This is especially interesting to me insofar as the knowledge that Ricky does and doesn't have, and the fact that he is the one who initiates this exchange: He is asserting knowledge that there *is* a "bad word," but the actual bad word is unknown to him. The knowledge that is pertinent is that he is privy to the fact that there is not-suitable-for-student information available to him.

Kelsey's role in the exchange is also interesting. While Kelsey appeared to have momentarily forgotten the word in line 11, it is my belief that her hesitation had less to do with the actual information, and more to do with gauging whether or not it was appropriate to display. This conflict seems to manifest itself by Kelsey walking a fine line between establishing her knowledge on this topic (line 11), and hesitating to actually share it, unlike Henry (line 12), who doesn't appear to have any type of filter in this particular case. Four days later, Ricky still wasn't sure of what the "bad word is," and students offered him a variety of answers before Ms. Mikes gave him the word he was looking for:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
1	Ricky	I have a question.
2	Henry	Ha!
3	Ricky	Which is, which is the, the the the bad word in
4	Students	Miércoles
5	Kelsey	Mier-mier mierdo, mierd
6	Mary	Mierto, right?
7	Ms. Mikes	Mierda.

In this case again, we see Kelsey striving to assert her knowledge of this topic, beyond the scope of her peers. Interestingly, Mary was the other student to do this, and these two girls were, by my assessment, but also according to Ricky and Henry in their interview, the two most competitive in the class. Also of interest is that Ms. Mikes willingly offered this information that certainly wasn't in the school curriculum. Although students wouldn't ever be assessed on it, their desire to know it and to demonstrate knowledge thereof became salient, perhaps because it was from the real-world in a sense that felt off-limits, or out-of-bounds.

These exchanges about the Juanes song weren't isolated insofar as the dynamic of students walking the line between asserting knowledge that isn't traditional student-knowledge, and keeping it to themselves, for a variety of reasons. Another clear example to consider is how Cassandra made it known multiple times that she was aware of an upcoming character death in the Mexican soap opera Rubí that the class usually watched on Fridays. When I asked her about it in an interview with her and Mary, this brief exchange occurred:

Line	Speaker	Interview Transcript
1	Sarah	Okay, so how do you know that?

2	Cassandra	'Cause people in Spanish 2 told me.
3	Sarah	Do you actually know who it is?
4	Cassandra	Yup.
5	Mary	Who is it?
6	Cassandra	I can't tell you. It's the fun of the story.
7	Mary	Tell me now. You've already told me.
8	Cassandra	You've gotta wait.

In this case, the element of propriety is different, in that Cassandra was avoiding spoiling the plot for Mary while, at once, maintaining her role as the one with the knowledge that she had acquired from beyond the classroom. This section has illustrated how students work to establish themselves as knowers of socially-valuable, real-world Spanish information. As noted by van Dam (2003), traditional research designs that focus on official in-class learning material may have overlooked some of these exchanges that occur beyond the boundaries of sanctioned curricular happenings. It is my argument that these exchanges give insight into how students are making the content socially meaningful (i.e. *authentic*) for them: These exchanges offer the ways by which Spanish-related stuff is pulled into students' social realms.

The sections that follow consider the value various language acts and language artifacts have for the students of Classroom 204, specifically as they relate to various authenticities.

Constructions of Authenticity

In Chapters 5 and 6, I examined the construct of authenticity in the classroom as it related to the immediate social meaningfulness of student and teacher talk. Here, I return to the construct of authenticity, but consider it as a characteristic that may be associated with particular language goods. *Language goods* is the term I'll use to talk about cultural

artifacts (e.g. songs, movies, etc.) that existed in or were brought into Classroom 204 that were meant to support, to various degrees and in various ways, the general goal of learning Spanish. I use the term *language* not to the exclusion of *culture*, which is one of the primary criteria that indicate the perceived in-class value of any given language good. In other words, the more culturally authentic a language good was perceived to be, the more it became coveted and made use of, and the more students strived to assert some association with it.

Language Goods, Symbolic Capital, and Authenticity

Every week in Classroom 204, students focused on a song in Spanish, which they would become familiar with over the course of the week. Oftentimes, like *Camisa negra*, these songs were authentic in the sense that they weren't written for language students (see Kramsch's, 1993, Chapter 6, discussion on this), but occasionally a song by Al Rap made an appearance.

Al Rap is an animated character developed for the purposes of teaching Spanish, who raps songs in Spanish that thematically align with each chapter of *Exprésate*, the textbook used in Classroom 204 (Humbach et al., 2006). And, while his contributions to the *Exprésate* curriculum are student-accessible and even periodically entertaining, Al Rap's music does not hold up against artists of the real world.

Students in Classroom 204 had a love-hate relationship with Al Rap. They engaged with the Spanish, by asking what things meant, by singing along, and even by singing to themselves when his songs weren't playing. Without fail, however they emphatically groaned and rolled their eyes with good humor whenever he was

mentioned. One morning while shuffling through his papers for an assignment completely unrelated to music, Henry came across a lyrics sheet to an Al Rap song that had been the song of the week months before. "I have the lyrics to *Somos campeones* just in case anyone needs it," he announced with good humor. Some of the kids groaned, and one commented "That was so bad".

Interestingly, while Ms. Mikes typically was the person to pick songs, and thus typically the person to bring Al Rap into the classroom, *Somos campeones* ("We're Champions") had actually been chosen by Ricky. Towards the beginning of the year, each student had a week in which they chose a song, and provided corresponding lyrics and a translation; *Somos campeones* had been Ricky's choice. "I don't know why he chose that one," said Ms. Mikes, laughing and somewhat confounded, when I asked her how each week's song was chosen. Henry also had something to say about Ricky's choice, as illustrated in this exchange that took place during an interview between the boys and I:

Line	**Speaker**	**Interview Transcript**
1	Sarah	When you guys did your canciones de la semana ("weekly songs"), when you picked them, how did you choose which ones to bring in?
2	Ricky	(*groans*) I don't know.
3	Henry	Well, Ricky is a loser.
4	Ricky	Mine was t-, Henry, yours was pretty bad too, dude.
5	Henry	Okay, it wasn't Al Rap! It wasn't something that was made for our class that- you could have just gone on the internet and gotten (inaudible .5s).

Here, we see Henry's playful declaration in line 3 that Ricky "is a loser" as a result of Ricky's choice in song. Ricky's retort in line 4 also critiques Henry's choice in

song: The language goods that one brings into Classroom 204 appear to affect one's social capital. While Ricky doesn't construct an argument as to why Henry's song was "pretty bad," Henry easily (and emphatically) articulates his problem with Ricky's choice as being based in the inauthenticity of *Somos campeones*. Indeed, it is at once Henry's proactive rebuttal against anything Ricky might say: According to Henry, it appears that a song made for students is due the least amount of social capital.

On the other hand, despite the inauthenticity of *Somos campeones*, Ricky claims his motives were related more to academic capital:

Line	Speaker	Interview Transcript
12	Ricky	It was so easy to get. I did it last second
13	Henry	Well maybe you should have put in more effort.
14	Ricky	I got a hundred on that dude. I'm good.

Henry disclosed that he did not get full credit for his song, which he said he found on YouTube after remembering the name of a band he knew Ms. Mikes liked. So, in this case it appears that authenticity is irrelevant to academic expectations, but relevant to social ones. Students exclusively make fun of Al Rap, and other *Exprésate* characters; language goods that are brought in from target language communities aren't held with the same disdain as Al Rap: They don't appear up for review in the same way. The students who bring them are held socially accountable ("Hey, nobody liked yours either, Henry," Ricky reminded him), but the songs themselves aren't made fun of or dismissed.

So we can't watch *Gol 2*: Unspoken Pre-requisites for Language Goods

The students in Classroom 204 watched and loved an American movie called *Gol* ("Goal") early in their academic year. It was about an impoverished Latin-American

teenaged soccer player in Los Angeles whose talent was discovered, and who ended up playing professionally. While the movie was written and acted in English, the class had watched it with Spanish audio and English subtitles. "It was all in Spanish," Henry explained, "and so then, since we all loved it, [Ms. Mikes] tried to get *Gol 2*[8]". Apparently, when the sequel arrived, students were excited to watch it, but couldn't.

"The problem," explained Ms. Mikes to the class, "is I special ordered it from Mexico, it's called *Gol 2*, and it's in English. And there's no Spanish subtitles... So we can't watch *Gol 2*". In his interview, Henry articulated the same problem almost verbatim:

Line	Speaker	Utterance
1	Henry	So [Ms. Mikes] hoped that it would be, you know, in Spanish 'cause she got it from Mexico.... And that's where she ordered it from and it said- the title was- Gol 2, but it turned out to be in, the options for the voicing.... there was no Spanish. So we can't watch Gol 2.

Everyone seemed particularly amused that the DVD came with a bevy of Asian language options, but no Spanish audio or subtitles. Further, the DVD actually included English audio, so the fact that both Ms. Mikes and Henry said they "couldn't" watch it, came along with the assumption not that it would be incomprehensible to everyone, but that it wasn't a language good that could be adopted as useful in the class because it didn't provide any use insofar as Spanish language.

It also seemed to be a tacit assumption that things that come out of Mexico are unfailingly tied to the Spanish language. The authenticity of *Gol 2* as an imported good

[8] Students and teacher alike say "2" as "dos," never "two"

from Mexico clashed ironically with the verdict that it wasn't linguistically appropriate for a Spanish-language classroom. The symbolic and geographic distance of Classroom 204 from Mexico may have promoted amusement around the language options of the DVD once it arrived in the classroom, rather than challenged the view that Mexican goods aren't necessarily synonymous with Spanish classroom language goods.

Lastly on this point, much of the discussion around *Gol 2* happened just before Ms. Mikes was planning an absence, and she was letting students chose what to watch with the substitute once they had finished their class work. The two options were *Rubí*, the soap opera from Mexico, and *Juguetes*, the Spanish title for *Toy Story*. Students chose to watch the latter. While the example of *Gol 2* doesn't highlight any student moves to associate with real world material, the marked lack of value that *Gol 2* had within the classroom because it wasn't in Spanish reveals a tacit prerequisite: Here, we see two American, English-language films available to watch (*Toy Story* and *Goal 2*), and it is readily accepted by everyone that the one with Spanish audio/subtitle options is the only one suitable for watching. This is the case even though culturally, *Goal 2* has *Toy Story* easily beat regarding culturally relevant contexts and storylines: While *Toy Story* takes place in a fantasy world of toys, *Goal 2* follows the trajectory of a Latin-American teenager whose story, albeit fiction, could arguably be relevant to a Spanish-language classroom because it focuses on a target language community that isn't terribly unlike those near Classroom 204. While *Gol 2* was perhaps culturally rich but linguistically lacking for the purposes of Classroom 204, the example that follows considers an artifact

that is arguably the opposite, a video called *Soy guapo* made by a white U.S. Spanish teacher in Illinois.

Soy Guapo

Soy guapo ("I'm Handsome") was a video posted online by a Spanish teacher in the U.S. in which he sang ironically in Spanish about his good looks. The video went viral during the year when the data for this study were collected. In Classroom 204, most students were aware that the video existed, but Quinn in particular was a big fan, and urged Ms. Mikes to show it in class because many of her peers hadn't seen it.

As noted in Chapter 5, Quinn wasn't as comfortable with grammar and vocabulary as many of her peers, and often was in a position where she would look to them for assistance, rather than vice versa. In the case of *Soy guapo*, however, Quinn became a stewardess for her peers, bringing this language good into Classroom 204, and facilitating its reception in various ways, from reminding Ms. Mikes to show it, to showing strong enthusiasm when it was time for her peers to watch it. The following exchange illustrates Quinn's active role while Ms. Mikes was setting up the video:

Line	Speaker	Actual Utterance	English Translation
1	Ms. Mikes	Okay, ahora quieren ver *Soy Guapo*.	Okay, now you guys want to watch *Soy Guapo*.
2	Quinn	¡Sí!	Yeah.
3	Ricky	I've never heard this before	
4	Quinn	Want me to find it?	
5	Ms. Mikes	No, ya lo tengo. Gracias.	No, I've got it. Thanks.
6	Quinn	Wait, yes or no?	
7	Ms. Mikes	No, ya tengo aquí. Ya lo encontré.	No, I have it here. I found it already.
8	(*15 seconds silence; Quinn goes to Ms. Mikes' desk.)*		
9	Ms. Mikes	Sí.	Yes.
10	Quinn	Sí. It's not playing. (*Video*	

		isn't projected)	
11	Ms. Mikes	Ah, sí, voy a pararlo aquí.	Ah, yeah, I'm going to stop it here.
12	Quinn	Start it from the beginning.	
13	Ms. Mikes	Sí, sí.	Yeah.
14	Henry	I haven't seen *Soy Guapo.*	
15	Quinn	It's really funny	

In this 15-line sequence, we see Quinn offer technological help in lines 4 and 10, even though this is generally something that Ms. Mikes navigates without need for assistance; we also see Quinn act as an enthusiastic one-woman chorus in response to Ms. Mikes' statement in line 1 that the students wanted to watch the video; we see her make a request of Ms. Mikes in line 12 to ensure her peers see the whole thing; and we see her report to Henry in line 15 that the video is "really funny," in response to his not having yet seen it. Once the video started, she also translated snippets of the lyrics ("He's saying that that guy's ugly and bald") and, once it concluded, she let her peers know that soon they'll be able to find it on iTunes. In short, Quinn positioned herself as a many-faceted stewardess of this language good.

In bringing the video into Classroom 204, Quinn reported to me that she was hoping to get extra credit ("'cause it's in Spanish"), but did not. Although her articulated aim appeared to be concrete academic capital in the form of bonus points, or perhaps lempiras, she also appeared to be striving to establish a certain ownership of the video by association with it. Indeed, in her interview, she further explained her knowledge of the video, saying not only that she "knew what they were saying, sort of," but that she recognized the actual street it had been filmed on in Colorado ("I, like, walked up the street where they filmed that and stuff"). In becoming the bearer of this language good to

Classroom 204, Quinn secured an insider position that, if not concretely academically beneficial, may have been socially so: In having already known about the lyrics, and about the setting in which it was filmed, Quinn held knowledge that her peers did not and, in emphasizing how "hysterical" she found the video to be, she may have been employing a strategy to urge her peers to agree with her that, yes, this language artifact she brought in was, indeed of value.

This contrasts fairly sharply with student reactions to the inauthenticity of Al Rap, which was consistently met with eye-rolling and sarcasm. While students didn't appear to take *Soy guapo* any more seriously than they did *Al Rap*, they did not complain about *Soy guapo,* but celebrated it. When asked in interviews, all students said they liked it, and most said they thought it was funny. And, unlike the occasional *Al Rap* lyric that a student would sing aloud in class to the great chagrin of his peers, students tended to all join in if the chorus of *Soy guapo* was initiated by anyone. Further, as we saw in the section about Mock Spanish in Chapter 5, Ricky even modified the lyrics to describe himself, appropriating the song for his own mischievous purposes (like singing his rendition into my audio recorder).

Authenticity, Value, and Proximity in Classroom 204

This chapter has considered the value of various types of knowledge and various language goods in the context of Classroom 204. While Chapters 5 and 6 considered the authenticity of talk in Classroom 204, and Chapter 7 considered the in-class economy and ways by which value is constructed throughout and as a result of the process of language learning, this chapter has considered the relationship between value and (real-world)

authenticity in Classroom 204. As Chapter 9 will further synthesize the findings of these chapters, here I will suffice to say that, three spectra have emerged out of the data: Authenticity, Value, and Proximity. In Classroom 204, these are interrelated and oftentimes correlated but are not entirely interdependent. For instance: A real-world (authentic) experience shared by Kelsey is treated as valuable and puts her beyond her less well-travelled peers on the proximity spectrum. In this case, high authenticity, high value, and high proximity, align. On the other hand sometimes their interrelatedness causes them to tug at each other in less predictable ways, such as when *Toy Story* was chosen over *Gol 2* (had higher classroom value) even though it represented a world far away from real-world Spanish communities, and thus would be lower on the proximity spectrum. The chapter that follows synthesizes the findings in a brief discussion and considers implications both for classroom practice and future research.

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSION: AN ECOLOGY OF AUTHENTICITY

This dissertation has set out to consider the challenge of authenticity in the context of one FL classroom. The research questions that guided this inquiry were:

1. How do FL participants manage the challenge of authenticity?
2. How is authenticity assigned value in the FL classroom?

Chapters 5 through 8 offered specific analyses that gave insights into the answers to these questions. In this concluding chapter, I first expand on the findings I've articulated previously, illustrating their implications for some of the theory I introduced in Chapters 2 and 3. Second, I connect my findings to wider pedagogical and empirical agendas that may inform future teaching and research.

Theoretical Implications

As reviewed in Chapters 2 and 3, bringing forth seemingly cohesive communities through imagination is a power social act- one the permits ideas such as *nation* to subsist. Anderson (1991) reviews how imagined communities such as nations are imagined into being by groups, and Norton (2001) and Kanno and Norton (2003) address individual students' understandings of their wider language communities. The latter researchers' work regarding how teachers and students may perceive of their language communities in different ways has lead them to conclude that incongruities between participants may ultimately prevent student progress for a number of reasons. These "disjunctures," between teacher and student conceptions of language communities, as characterized by Norton (2001), are present over time (p. 70). In the present study, I have considered what

I call "boundary clashes," which are akin to disjunctures, but are momentary. They don't necessarily cause challenges to student progress, but they certainly offer insight into how participants understand the *realness* of any given moment within their FL classroom.

Just as "material effects" (see Ahmed, 2000, p. 70) such as a national anthem, standardized language, or a dollar bill lend themselves to the concretization of the illusion of *nation*, the imagined communities within and beyond the FL classroom become concrete and tangible with materials devised within or imported from beyond the classroom. For instance, in Classroom 204, the local lempira economy comprised a local market that regulated value specific to the classroom. When participants were focused on lempiras, they were focused on their immediate educational and social settings; in effect, the imagined aspects of their FL classroom experience were traded in for something that could be earned, bargained for, and (in Kelsey's case) stolen. The preoccupation of the FL classroom with the outside world- the world in which students might one day use their language skills- dissolved when students were dealing directly with lempiras. So, interestingly, it appears that FL classrooms depend on imagined communities to exist when those classrooms are oriented beyond the FL classroom; the façade becomes less necessary to the workings of the FL classroom when local purpose (and local rules, meaning, etc.) emerges.

Of course, as with all local monetary economies, the distribution of the haves and the have-nots is theoretically representative of the symbolic power systems of the larger society (Bourdieu, 1977). Or, conversely, the symbolic and concrete manifestations of power that students in Classroom 204 had are theoretically representative of the world

beyond their classroom (which, of course, is also the world that brought forth the classroom). Kelsey, for example, established herself as an advanced language student with much in-class social and academic capital: She knew the right answers, got good grades, had a staggering collection of lempiras (which reinforced her reputation as strong Spanish student, even once they were stolen) and, perhaps most importantly she was a world citizen in many ways: She had travelled to various continents, and her parents were both from the middle east. She spoke basic (arguably token) amounts of her parents' first languages. In essence, it was Kelsey's tourist experience outside of Classroom 204 that, combined with her language prowess, allowed her to assert the expertise she did about the target language community, bolstering her in-class value as a language student, because she brought with her some real-world offerings of authenticity.

Worldwide, tourists are, by definition, a privileged group, and this was indeed reflected within Classroom 204; Kelsey, the most well travelled of her peers, also held the most lempiras. Importantly, though, is the fact that tourists, by definition, exist apart from the people whose communities they are visiting. And, indeed, tourists often enjoy luxuries such as maid-service and not reporting for work that their quotidian at-home lives don't necessarily permit. So, albeit momentarily, to be a tourist is to be privileged, and separate from the host community; similarly, in-class value in Classroom 204 appeared to be more about having witnessed and bringing back, rather than being, or having belonged. In other words, the value that emerged in Classroom 204 was central to the participants' (somewhat voyeuristic) experiences of the *real world*. Local and global Spanish speakers in the city beyond the classroom weren't agents in constructing in-class

value, but were present as figures and past informants. Fact-like pieces of experience traversed the boundaries of the FL classroom, but they weren't catalysts of social integration as much as they were souvenirs of the FL student mind- tokens of that which is foreign or authentic, of that which is *different* and therefore noteworthy.

The section that follows returns focus to the inner-workings of the FL classroom as a bounded ecological niche that, while brought forth by wider society, can be understand independently of it, in an ethnomethodological sense. Understanding the FL classroom in the context of the wider world, as I have done above, is an ecologically necessary step to understanding the effects and implications of the FL classroom upon the wider world (and vice versa). However, understanding Classroom 204 based on the socially-situated local ways by which the classroom ecology finds and maintains balance is also key to understanding. The following section attempts to do just that.

An Ecology of Authenticity

As noted at the end of Chapter 8, a series of spectra have emerged out of the data. The constant push-pull nature of social negotiation is a process in which, in each instance of negotiation, some well-fitted middle ground is settled upon that links the disparate "this" or "that" pre-negotiation scenario. The "this" or "that" may be understood as extremes of various spectra that remain relatively stable in Classroom 204: Those of authenticity, value, and social proximity.

The authenticity spectrum can be understood in two ways, and based on how participants bring forth and handle the construct of authenticity, I actually conceive of it as two separate spectra. The first treats authenticity as a local phenomenon: The socially

meaningful interactions and exchanges that happen in Classroom 204 are highly authentic, independent of any connection with the outside, real-world. The second authenticity spectrum, then, relates to the real-world, the two extremes being language that exists solely within a textbook or curriculum, and language stuff that exists beyond the walls of the classroom in Spanish-speaking communities. Further research might consider participants' understandings of the authentic niches in their own classrooms: In which ways is in-class, social authenticity confounded with real-world authenticity, and how does that tug at the spectrum of in-class value?

These four spectra (local in/authenticity, in-class vs. real-world, value, and social distance vs. proximity) are not independent of one another, but comprise an adaptive web that cradles each language act and language good, tugging them into place to ensure smooth operation of the FL classroom system. This ecology of authenticity serves as an apt response to Train's (2007) often-heard question about how the FL can be made real to students (p. 224). While Train's question, and the common question of those invested in the FL education endeavor almost certainly relates to how to bring closer the people and cultures who are "far removed from us in time and space," I suggest a local orientation in answering it, which is outlined in the following sections on pedagogical and research implications (Shumway, 1995, p. 252).

Pedagogical Implications

In order to understand how an FL can be made real to students, why not start with how it is made real by students? The very nature of the FL classroom mandates that social actors manage the challenge of authenticity; in doing so, local authenticities spring

forth. This process of making authenticity, sometimes at the fringes of the official FL curriculum, may be denied or ignored, but it is there regardless. The assumption that authenticity is something that exists on the outside of the classroom, to be imported in, is a distraction. Educators might ask themselves: Do authentic language and culture need to come from afar in order to be educationally valuable? Lambert (1990) notes that FL educators are:

> usually humanists, lovers of foreign treasure sites like Florence, Rome, Paris, Vienne, or pre-Mao China; usually they are primarily interested in literature, in story telling and story reading, and the stories they highlight are viewed as classics, the important exports from the old world to the new (p. 323).

FL educators will do well to practice self-reflection regarding the language- and culture-proficiency pay-offs of bringing things they love into the classroom versus cultivating in-class meaning that isn't authentic in the real-world sense. They can work to uncover the threshold at which in-class talk becomes socially authentic, or focus on how value drives different types of student engagement. Reassessing the assumption that far-off imported cultural matter is of supreme value to the FL classroom, the FL educator may be able to lend focus to how engagement with real content is underway already by their own students on the boundaries of the official curriculum.

I may go so far as to argue that the challenge of authenticity falls apart when we trade in the assumption of inherent value in that which is foreign for an assumption that culture inevitably happens when authentic language happens. That is, if we, as FL educators foster real talk in the FL classroom, new ways of doing will fall into place that

are associated with the FL. Those ways of doing- that emergent classroom culture- may not be "authentic" in the sense that they are the same ways of doing as those who speak the language at a vacation destination, but we are not training tourists. We are training world citizens.

Nocon (1995) urges FL educators to start at "our spot on the globe" (p. 63). Following her lead, I argue that the Spanish heard in the communities geographically closest to the FL classroom ought to serve as an apt model for FL students: Not only will students learn the version of Spanish they are most likely to hear and use, but in learning the local Spanish, those students are *not* being trained to bring a colonizing version of it to their local interactions. As Henry so astutely pointed out, FL students in the U.S. aren't in Spain: Learning (and speaking) the Iberian variety of the language implies an affiliation with Spain, which likely connotes either the privilege to travel, identification with the colonizer, or some ambivalence towards the Spanish language that is immediately locally accessible. Regardless of conscious intention, training FL students to speak a non-local, historically imperialist version of Spanish arguably disassembles the cultural and social bridges that FL education purports to construct. Or, alternately, the bridges that *are* being fashioned traverse the Atlantic but don't reach across town.

Nocon's (1995) call to start locally likely refers to community uses of Spanish, but it can also be a reminder of the existence of Spanish that is local to specific FL classrooms: Focusing on the local authenticity that emerges out of socially meaningful language use *within* the FL classroom (such as Monday morning discussions, or the naming of Sra. Miques) is both socially and pedagogically progressive in that when

students step beyond their classroom to engage in the FL for the first time in their wider communities, it is not the first time they will be using it meaningfully. In a sense, they will already be speakers of (one) local Spanish dialect.

Research Implications

Further research ought also to venture farther into the landscape of critical analysis, which is an ethically complex undertaking when researching classrooms of earnest, well-meaning participants. Valdés et al. (2003) disclose that the process of submitting their publication involved prolonged discussions on what was ethically sound, presumably because it is questionable to critique people's unwitting complicity in the process by which native speakers may be othered. It is understandably much easier to conduct a critical analysis of a FL textbook, such as those reviewed in Chapter 2, than to conduct such a critique of people. Not only are FL textbook analyses firmly situated in impersonal territory, but the worlds brought forth by textbooks are often cohesive, ideal, and inherently less complex than real life. One of my biggest reservations, for example, in categorizing Quinn's Mock Spanish as more abrasive than that of her peers is that it may indicate that her complicity in that Anglo-centric trend spills into all facets of her studentship as a Spanish leaner; it does not.

Further, the present study has attempted to deny an orientation that places blame on a single player or curricular artifact, and instead approaches the phenomenon of managing authenticity as a complex socially-constructed, ever-in-process set of emergent activities, all of which presumably have a socially-situated good reason for existing as they do. For example, referring to Ms. Mikes as *Ms. Miques*, could be analyzed

exhaustively from a critical point of view, but doing so in this case would be a critical exercise that wouldn't reveal much about role the name *Ms. Miques* played in cultivating a First Street Middle School FL community.

Perhaps I was lucky to not have to address blatant othering and Anglo-centrism in Classroom 204; indeed, such phenomena were disassembled as a matter of course. I can claim trustworthiness in my analysis due to this, as I initially had been assuming I would find more material to critically contemplate; following the data I had, however, I found the negotiation of local authenticity to be at the crux of how the social actors in Classroom 204 managed their challenge of authenticity. Future research may have a more precarious balance to strike in finding both the "good reasons" and the critical pitfalls of single classroom incidences.

The K-12 FL classroom is strangely absent from SLA and FL literature. While Classroom 204 is not well represented in previous empirical literature, it served as a phenomenal site in which to do some rich exploration of long-standing theories, such as Anderson's (1991) imagined communities and Bourdieu's (1992) symbolic capital. Indeed, these two theories together, allowed an analysis of an FL classroom that went beyond visualizing imagined FL futures and assessing students' in-class social and academic power: The combination of the theories actually allowed me to understand how *present* (not future) creations of the authentic became valuable, and how that which was assigned value, in turn, emerged as presently authentic.

The happenings of Classroom 204 aren't extensively generalizable, but that hasn't been the intention of this project. The intention has been exploratory in nature, making

sense of one facet of a messy, complex FL classroom that is often seen through a more organized lens that may not have included all of the off-script exchanges that gave way to my findings. Ecologically-informed discourse analysis permitted this messy venture to take shape, as ecologically it is necessarily to understand phenomena on a global level, but discourse-analytically, it is the highly local ways of constructing realities through talk that permit entry into the world(s) of the participants. Key variables in further pursuing this heuristic and refining understandings of local authenticity in FL classrooms include considering schools situated in different socio-economic and linguistic communities, populated with different participant demographics (including heritage speaking students and/or native speaking teachers), with larger class sizes, and so on. My particular site has served perfectly for considering the demographics it has; no qualitative study of this nature can simultaneously investigate all socio-political contexts. Future research ought to consider how (local) authenticity is created in a variety of FL classroom settings: How do the social actors in those classrooms make their FL real?

APPENDIX I
STUDENT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Sample of questions for all student participants

1. How does Ms. Mikes start your class every day?
2. Are there words that you always say in English, or always say in Spanish?
3. How did you get your Spanish name?
4. What's your understanding of the differences between *ustedes* and *vosotros*?
5. What are lempiras?
6. Can you give an example of a sentence you might have to translate for an activity or quiz?
7. How did you choose your *canciones de la semana* (songs of the week)?
8. On Monday mornings, do you always talk about your weekend? What happens if you don't know how to say what you did in Spanish?
9. When are/n't your Spanish names used?
10. When do you watch Rubí? (Why on Fridays?)
11. Who is Al Rap?
12. What's a Mexican, Spanish, or other Latin tradition that you know about? Describe it.
13. What happens when someone has a birthday?

Sample of questions for specific student participants

Questions for Cassandra:

1. When did you start saying OMG in Spanish?
2. How do you know someone dies at the end of this season of Rubí?

Questions for Henry:

1. When did you start doing that Spanish announcer voice?
2. What's *Gol dos*?
3. You and Ricky joke around a lot with one another using Spanish. Can you talk to me about this?

Questions for Erica:

1. Do you prefer to work alone or in a group?
2. How do you notice if someone has a different accent in Spanish?

Questions for Quinn:

1. When you don't know how to say something in Spanish, how do you proceed?
2. Tell me about the *Soy guapo* video. Where did you find it, etc.?

Questions for Mary:

1. Sometimes I notice you come up with what a Spanish word might be, even if you don't know for sure. Are you more likely to say the English, or give a try in Spanish first?
2. Do you remember what Ms. Mikes' response was when you asked about which Rosetta Stone language to use?

Questions for Kelsey:

1. What's an *oficina*?
2. When you were in Spain and Peru, what were some things that you noticed that were different from here, or that surprised you?
3. Do you prefer to work alone or in groups?
4. How do you know the swears in Spanish?
5. On Monday mornings, when you're talking about your weekend, how do you decide to use Spanish or English? (You usually try Spanish, but the Wizard Quest you asked if you could speak in English.)

Questions for Ricky:

1. What types of things do you say into my recorder?
2. Tell me about the *Soy guapo* video. Who was in it?
3. You and Henry joke around a lot with one another using Spanish. Can you talk to me about this?
4. How did you become the designated phone-answerer in your Spanish class?

APPENDIX II
TRANSCRIPT: THE HUNGER GAMES

3/26/12
Transcript A

Ms. Mikes: Buenos días!
Students: Buenos días!
Ms. Mikes: Cómo están?
Students: Muy bien, gracias, ¿y usted?
Ms. Mikes: Muy bien, gracias. Estás bien, Eri? (*laughs*).
Erica: (inaudible? Or, maybe gestures)
Ms. Mikes: Excelente. Qué tal el fin de semana?
Kelsey: Muy bien!
Students: Muy bien!
Ms. Mikes: Sí? Quién fue a ver la película *Los juegos del hambre*?
?: Woooo!
Mary: Dos!
Quinn: [Dos!
Ricky: [No, no!
Ms. Mikes: Por qué? Dos veces?
Ricky: No, no veo.
Ms. Mikes: Sí, por qué les fascina a las chicas pero no a los chicos?
Kelsey: Es muy muy bien.
Ricky: Ah, uh…
Ms. Mikes: Es muy buena.
Cassandra: Los chicos le gusta!
Ms. Mikes: Sí, pero
Ricky: Juego, uh, er, juegue.
Ms. Mikes: Jugué.
Ricky: Jugué. Sorry.
Ms. Mikes: No, está bien.
Ricky: Um, uh
Ms. Mikes: Golf.
Ricky: Um. No.
Ms. Mikes: No? No juegas al golf?
Ricky: Juegas un, el beis- el bisbol.
Ms. Mikes: El beisbol.
Ricky: Cuatro, um, how do you say games?
Ms. Mikes: Partidos, o juegos.
Ricky: Um, cuatro parti- or partidos
Henry: Ricardo!
Ms. Mikes: Muy bien! Y Qué tal?
Ricky: Uh, um, (2) Oh my gosh, I'm forgetting won.
Ms. Mikes: Ganamos

Ricky: Gaman-
Ms. Mikes: Ganamos!!
Ricky: Ganamos-
Henry: Dos
Ricky: cuatro.
Ms. Mikes: OOhh! Muy bien! Ésto es el equipo de (school name) o es otro equipo?
Ricky: Oh, otro equipo.
Ms. Mikes: Aha
Ricky: [team name]
Ms. Mikes: Muy bien. Excelente, felicidades. Um, pero no, no me contestaron- por qué a todas las chicas les fascina eso de, de los juegos del hambre pero no a los chicos? [[me parece (1s?) de acción]]
Kelsey: [[(inaudible 3 s)]]
Ms. Mikes: Ah…
Mary: Sí.
Ms. Mikes: Pero
Ricky: El actréz es muy (inaudible 1s)
Ms. Mikes: La héroe es, es una chica
Ricky: I guess
Ms. Mikes: No?
Kelsey: Sí, but
(much talking 2-3 seconds- inaudible except for the word "guapo")
Ricky: Actréz es un bikini model. El actréz es un bikini model!
Mary?: Yes
Ms. Mikes: Ah, entonces, la actríz también es guapa.
Kelsey: Limpiras (?)
Ricky: Sí.
Ms. Mikes: Pero entonces la-
Students: (chatter- inaudible)
Ms. Mikes: Shhhh. Ah, ah, shhhhh. Ricardo. Entonces, si la actríz es muy guapa por qué no, los chicos no quieren ir a la película?
Ricky: Ah, (*whispers*: I just didn't have any time)
Ms. Mikes: No, pero en general,
Henry: Es malo
Ms. Mikes: en general, me parece que todas las chicas (1 s?) y siempre yo pido ¿qué hicieron este fin de semana? Todas las chicas de todas mis clases [Ricky: That's a bad thing(?)] fueron a ver esa película.
Ricky?: That's not a bad thing (?)
Ms. Mikes: Y solo un chico fue a verla.
Kelsey: It's cause more girls read the book.
Cassandra: I didn't see it.
Ms. Mikes: Por qué? Por qué leen-
Students: (inaudible chatter)

Ms. Mikes: CassandrIa y Ricardo.
Ricky: Okay.
Ms. Mikes: Cómo?
Kelsey: Cause (1s) más, más chicas l-
Ms. Mikes: Leen los libros?
Kelsey: Sí?
Ms. Mikes: Pero por qué les interesa más a las chicas? [Ricky: No me gusta]. O, a los chicos simplemente no les gusta leer?
Henry: Tengo
Kelsey: Yeah, sí.
Ms. Mikes: Ya entiendo.
Henry: Tengo un (high pitched mmmm sound)
Ms. Mikes: Ah, hay [[mucho romance en la película?
Ricky: [[Yeah, that
Henry: Es parte un chic-flic
Cassandra: No! [[It's mostly about killing!
Henry: [[I don't even know, I don't even know! (Inaudible 1 s)
Ricky: *(singing to self continually over last 10 lines)*
Students: (chatter- inaudible 2s, arguing over theme of movie)
Ms. Mikes: Ah, perdón! En español
?: Henry, the books are (1s?)
Ms. Mikes: Enrique. Enrique.
Ricky: Sí. (Él es?) primero.
?: Is that it?
Ricky: (*chatting to self*)
Ms. Mikes: Qué dijiste? Que hay mucho- Ricardo!
Henry: Yo lo sé porque yo no leer el libro
Ms. Mikes: Aha, pero te parece que hay mucho romance y por eso te parece que es más para chicas.
Henry: Sí.
Ms. Mikes: Interesante.
Mary: Mi padre (2s) Cómo se dice wanted to be cool-
Henry: (talking in background)
Ms. Mikes: Enriqué!
Mary: Wanted to be cool. Wants to be cool?
Henry: Sorry.
Ms. Mikes: Quiere.
Mary: Quiere
Ms. Mikes: Ser.
Mary: Ser (1s) Frío? (laughs)
Ms. Mikes: Cool, no- cool's always hard. It- it- [[it's so like
Mary: [[Fun, okay, I'll just
Ricky: Divertido

Ms. Mikes: Depending on which language it is or even that like dialects of the language but,
Mary: Divertido
Ms. Mikes: Yeah, divertido, o
Mary: So, um, um, él, I mean usted, um, lee uh, los
Ms. Mikes: no, *él* lee los- leyó los libros
Mary: Leyó los libros
Ms. Mikes: Ahh, y le gustaron?
Mary: Oh, he's- he just started it. Cause he saw the movie.
Ms. Mikes: Ahhh, entonces fue a ver la película primero, y ahora empezó a leer los libros, aha.
Kelsey: Yo leo los primero dos libros en seis horas.
Mary: Oh, wow.
Ms. Mikes: Sí, porque yo no leí nada y ni fui a ver la película, pero me parece que el libro- yo no lo leí, porque me parece que tiene mucho que ver con violencia y acción y todo eso.
Quinn: Es muy [[muy bien.
Kelsey: [[Muy muy bien.
Ms. Mikes: Buena. Sí.
Mary: Pero, um la (1.0) fin, final ah, ah, novela es muy (3s). Cómo se dice depressing?
Ms. Mikes: Deprimente.
Mary: De-deprimente.
Ms. Mikes: Uh-huh
?: They skipped a lot of parts.
Mary: Yeah, I know.
Quinn: And when Peeta goes, when he's like—
Ms. Mikes: Ah, ah, ah
Ricky: Boom.
Ms. Mikes: Cómo?
?: Peeta, Peeta dice
Quinn: Oh, oh, Peeta dice, um, nosotros, in (*pronounced een*), hang on I got this
Mary: Amor?
Kelsey: It's a quote?
?: Amore? What does that mean?
Quinn: In amore y (1s) how do you say 'feel free to kiss me any time'?
Ms. Mikes: Y (1.5s) bésame cuando quieras. [Mary: I forgot] Bésame cuando quieras. Sí?
Students: (chattering during Ms. Mikes's last utterance. Most inaudible; I hear high-pitched squealing and mostly indecipherable English.)
Ms. Mikes: Ay, so entonces Enrique tiene razón! Hay mucho romance!
Students: (much chatter mostly inaudible. I hear "un beso!")
Ms. Mikes: Esperen! Le toca a QuInn.
Quinn: Cave scene, it's the cave scene.

Henry: Oh, there's a cave scene!
Ms. Mikes: La escena en la cueva (*laughs*)
Students: (erupt into inaudible chatter again 5 s. Some pieces audible:)
?: Things, and then she does it again
Ms. Mikes: Cassandra.
Mary: Well the first on was only cheek.
Ms. Mikes: You know, I'm going to start charging you lempiras, I'm going to take away lempiras if I hear English.
Ricky: Buen idea.
Ms. Mikes: Sí
?: Ricardo!
Ms. Mikes: Hablen, pero hablen en español! Y una vez (1 s?)
Ricky: (Puntos?)
Ms. Mikes: Okay, entonces parece que Enrique tiene razón. Lo que más discuten de la película es el romance.
Quinn: No. Es acción.
Kelsey: Solo uno- un beso
Ms. Mikes: Un beso.
Kelsey: En el libro, es. Son, son, like tres.
Ms. Mikes: Tres besos?
Quinn: Cuatro besos.
?: Cinco!
Quinn: Es muchos, muchos, how do you say blood?
Ms. Mikes: Sangre. Mucha sangre.
Mary: Sí. Sí, sí, sí.
Ms. Mikes: Sí, por eso no me gustaría.
Quinn: How do you say, yeah
Henry?: Los! Los!
Quinn: He takes his head and jerks it
Ms. Mikes: Ah, le, le (?) la cabeza.
Students: (chatter 2 s.)
Ms. Mikes: Okay, por favor saquen la tarea que es las frases de Rubí y las correcciones de las pruebas.

APPENDIX III

TRANSCRIPT: THE ROSETTA STONE DISCUSSION

2/7/12
Transcript C

Ms. Mikes: Ok, and then in the reflexive instead of that you're gonna have the "se". Okay that's the only difference between the reflexive and the direct object. Okay so, um, let's keep reading, it says, um.
Mary: Oh
Ms. Mikes: Sí
Mary: I have a quick question
Ms. Mikes: Sí.
Mary: It's about Spanish, but it's a little off topic.
Ms. Mikes: Sí.
Mary: Are we learning more Latin American Spanish or Spain Spanish?
Ms. Mikes That's a good question. Um (5). Yeah, I'm trying to, so there's two ways to answer it. I speak Spanish that's more Latin American Spanish so in one way what you're learning about listening to me is that. On the other hand, I try and let you all know at any time when that varies significantly from the Spain Spanish, and then teach you that too. Right, so like what are some examples of that
Henry: Vosotros! (*dramatic accent that almost sounds Italian*)
Ms. Mikes: The vosotros form! So whenever I point that out and say hey where is this said so that you're learning both and I'm trying to teach you both, and I'm trying to point out hey if you go to Spain you're going to want to know this vosotros form, but in Latin America and in the Spanish you're gonna hear me speak, you're not gonna hear that vosotros form.
Mary: So, but we're mainly learning like Latin, like I know you're pointing out the Spanish or Spain stuff, but we're mainly learning the Latin American?
Ms. Mikes: I point it out cause I tend to speak Latin American Spanish, but in terms of the book it tries to present
Mary: Everything?
Ms. Mikes: No, it doesn't try to present everything, but it tries to choose I think the most commonly understood
Mary: Oh.
Ms. Mikes: So it tries to avoid words that would maybe only be used in Mexico or only be used in Spain, but that's not always successful, there's a lot of variation.
(Someone interrupts class, thinking the room would be empty—this lasts about 30 seconds in all)
Ms. Mikes: Um, so ok, so and within that within your question, so, if you go to there's not enough difference – the difference between like Latin American

Spanish for people who are educated, right, like well educated people, the difference is not that much greater than the diff between you know British English or Australian English or U.S, English, right, so you just learn English that might mean when you go to Britain you're going to come up against words you're not familiar with

Henry: Like monkey nut!

Ms. Mikes: Like- *laughs*

Henry: That's peanut

Ms. Mikes: That's what they call monkey nut?

Henry: Peanut in Britain is a monkey nut.

Erica: Fish and chips.

Ms. Mikes: Or chips are fries, but, so, is that gonna mean that you can't communicate in Britain? No, so it's the same. Like whatever Spanish you're learning when if you go to Spain you're going to come across words that you never learned in your Spanish class but you're still generally gonnna be able to understand everything they say and they're be able to understand everything you say. I was just saying Latin America but when there are but then they try and prevent this generalized Spanish that would be used everywhere trying to avoid words that are specific to Spain, or specific to Mexico or specific to Argentina and then look at the words that you're gonna encounter when you go there.

Mary: I was looking at Rosetta Stone and I wanted to like see like the Spanish stuff.

Ms. Mikes: Oh yeah.

Mary: and I was going on Spanish but they were like you wanna learn Latin American Spanish or Spain Spanish?

Ms. Mikes: Yeah, and that's gonna be, there's always gonna be some lexical variation in other words different words, and there's gonna be some accent variation so maybe the things that you'd be listening to would be if you chose Spain Spanish they would chose, that would be the main accent that you'd hear is the Spain Spanish.

Ricky: Would you do Latin American Spanish?

Henry: I mean if you had to make the choice it'd probably be Latin America- I mean cause they're right there.

Ms. Mikes: Or I would maybe chose sometimes this and sometimes can you switch back and forth day by day.

Mary: You have to go on different like levels.

Ms. Mikes: oh, ok. I mean I would probably chose Latin American cause it's much more likely living in Texas you're going to encounter Latin American Spanish and Latin American speakers.

Mary: As long as you're in the U.S you're more like-

Quinn: So Spain people, they'd still be able to understand us?

Ms. Mikes: Yes.

Keley: No, it was confusing when I was there. Cause I'd be like saying something that would be right but then they'd be like what and then they'd say things that I didn't under-

Ms. Mikes: And that's gonna be true anywhere you go because you're still learning the language.

Kelsey: And they all have like weird like they talk like super fast and have they have like weird lisps but I didn't-

Ms. Mikes: They don't have weird lisps. They have a different accent.

Kelsey: Yeah it's like a different kinda thing.

Ms. Mikes: Right

Kelsey: And like the things that I would say would sound like (???)

Ms. Mikes: And that's because you have probably not, you know, at least at (this school) you've never had a teacher who speaks to you with a Spanish accent, but, like I said that accent is not insurmountable just like when you go to, if you go to England. You're not like oh my gosh I don't understand a word these people are saying because they speak with these weird vowel sounds and like I just don't understand. I mean you can understand the English right if you go to see a movie that has British you understand it. We actually think we love it –cute sexy accent that the Brits have right so you understand it. It's the same. They're gonna- you're gonna understand them. They're gonna understand you, it's just gonna sounds a little different from what you're used to. Does that make sense?

Henry: (inaudible- laughs)

Ms. Mikes: Okay, same when you go to Australia, it just sounds different or even if you come from Texas and go up north it sounds different like people down here talk different.

Student: Y'all

Ms. Mikes: But it doesn't impede communication among well educated people

Henry: Unless you're making fun of them.

Ms. Mikes: The further down the kind of educational ladder you go in other words people with less education, it becomes more and more different to understand right because it's just um, education standardizes things. And makes things universal. There's a lot more slang, there's a lot more colloquial there's a lot more variation in someone's accent if they have less education so if you go you know to a mountain village in Mexico or a little rural town in Spain you're gonna have a lot more difficulty in understanding what they're saying but if you, you know, are speaking with other high school students or college students in any of those countries it will be much ea- even you won't have difficultly. So, it's not a it's not like choosing a different language like oh my gosh, what do I chose Spain or Latin America? It's not really going to matter. You're going o learn Spanish either way it's not going to cause you problems. Sí?

Henry: So, wouldn't that also be kind of like you know people in more urban areas are more exposed to all the different accents and things and might be able to understand more.

Ms. Mikes: That, it's true too, is true too yeah . And people in urban areas tend to be more educated.

Henry: Well, yeah.

Ms. Mikes: Yes, it's all- Yes, you're absolutely right, it's a matter of exposure. So if you've only spent your whole life talking to the same twenty people in your village then they tend to develop their own speech patterns and their own words and their own, and then it makes it and they're not familiar, and you're not as familiar with that too, so then. Okay. I don't know where we were at. Ricardo. Aquí. A reflexive verb. Puedes leer aquí?

APPENDIX IV

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

Italics	Explanation of non-verbal context (e.g. *students laugh*)
[Name and utterance in Brackets]	Utterance embedded within another speaker's turn.
(1.5s)	Seconds of silence.
(1.5s inaudible)	Seconds of inaudible speech
…	Speaker trails off
(…)	Speaker continues, but the speech isn't included in transcript for brevity.
-	Speaker abruptly stops, possibly due to interruption
[speech [speech	Overlapping speech by two or more participants.

Conversational Turns and Numbering

In all transcripts, each conversational turn corresponds with a consecutive number. Conversational turns are labeled as "lines" in the transcript tables, and referred to as such in analysis.

All transcripts included in the dissertation begin with line 1. An exception is those discourse sequences that are broken up within the text of the dissertation. The numbering of these sequences is continuous from one transcript to the next, reflecting the continuity of the original dialogue.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. (2000). *Strange encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality*. New York: Routledge

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1999). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century: Including Chinese, classical languages, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish*. Lawrence, KS: National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. New York: Verso.

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute.

Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge Falmer.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press.

Barnwell, D. (2008). The status of Spanish in the United States. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *21*(3), 235–243. doi:10.1080/07908310802385907

Bauman, R., & Sherzer, J. (1989). Introduction to the second edition. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (2nd ed., pp. ix–xxvii). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bejan, A., & Zane, J. P. (2013). *Design in nature: how the constructal law governs evolution in biology, geophysics, technology, and social organization*. New York: Anchor Books.

Bhabha, H. K. (2013). *Nation and narration*. New York: Routledge.

Blanton, C. K. (2004). *The strange career of bilingual education in Texas, 1836-1981*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2007). Sociolinguistic scales. *Intercultural pragmatics*, *4*(1), 1–19.

Blommaert, P. D. J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. (R. Nice, Trans.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1992). *Language and symbolic power*. (J. B. Thompson, Ed.). Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Brown, B. (2008). *I thought it was just me (but it isn't): making the journey from "what will people think?" to "I am enough."* New York: Gotham Books.

Capra, F. (1996). *The web of life*. New York: Doubleday.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clark, J. (1981). Communication in the classroom. *Modern Languages in Scotland*, 2122, 144-56.

Collins, S. (2008). *The hunger games*. New York: Scholastic, Inc.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*(3), 402–423.

Cook, V. (2003). Materials for adult beginners from an L2 user perspective. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 275–290). New York: Continuum.

Cook, V. (2013). *Second language learning and language teaching* (4th ed.). Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Crookes, G. (1997). SLA and language pedagogy: A socioeducational perspective. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(1), 93–116.

Dailey-O'Cain, J., & Liebscher, G. (2009). Teacher and student use of the first language in foreign language classroom interaction: Functions and applications. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 131–144). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Damasio, A. R. (1994). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain*. New York: Avon Books.

Davis, B., & Sumara, D. J. (2006). *Complexity and education: inquiries into learning, teaching, and research*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Erickson, F. (2004). *Talk and social theory: Ecologies of speaking and listening in everyday life*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. New York: E. Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (2001a). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2001b). The discourse of new labour: Critical discourse analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 229–266). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*(3), 285-300.

Foley, D. E. (2010). *Learning capitalist culture: Deep in the heart of Tejas* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Franklin, C. E. M. (1990). Teaching in the target language. *Language Learning Journal*, *2*, 20–24.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Gardner, R. (1985). *Social psychology and language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Baltimore: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.

Gass, S. (1998). Apples and oranges: Or, why apples are not orange and don't need to be a response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, *82*(1), 83–90.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York: Routledge.

Gifford, B. R., & Valdes, G. (2006). The linguistic isolation of Hispanic students in California's public schools: The challenge of reintegration. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, *105*(2), 125–154.

Gleick, J. (1987). *Chaos: Making a new science*. New York: Penguin Books.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: an analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, *18*, 213–231.

González, G. G. (1999). Segregation and the education of Mexican children. In J. F. Moreno (Ed.), *The elusive quest for equality: 150 years of Chicano/Chicana education* (pp. 53–76). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Guthrie, E. (1987). Six cases in classroom communication: A study of teacher discourse in the foreign language classroom. In J. P. Lantolf & A. Labarca (Eds.), *Research in second language learning: focus on the classroom: proceedings of the 6th Delaware Symposium on Language Studies, October 1984, the University of Delaware* (pp. 173–93). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Pub.Corp.

Haugen, E. I. (1972). *The Ecology of Language*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hill, J. H. (2008). *The everyday language of white racism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hirsch, E. D. (2006). *The knowledge deficit: Closing the shocking education gap for American children*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hirsch, E. D., Kett, J. F., & Trefil, J. S. (1988). *Cultural literacy: what every American needs to know*. New York: Vintage Books.

Hornberger, N. H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, *1*(1), 27–51.

Hornberger, N. H., & Hult, F. M. (2008). Ecological language education policy. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 280–96). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hult, F. M. (2010). Analysis of language policy discourses across the scales of space and time. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2010* (202), 7–24.

Humbach, N. A., Velasco, S. M, & Chiquito, A. B. (2006). ¡*Exprésate! Student Edition, Level 1*. Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hurtado, A., & Rodriguez, R. (1989). Language as a social problem: The repression of Spanish in south Texas. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *10*(5), 401–423.

Hutchinson, J. N. (2004). Democracy needs strangers, and we are them. In C. Bingham & Sidorkin, Alexander M. (Eds.), *No education without relation*. New York: Peter Lang.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kanno, Y., & Norton, B. (2003). Imagined communities and educational possibilities: Introduction. *Journal of Language Identity and Education*, *2*(4), 241–250.

Kinginger, C. (2004). Alice doesn't live here anymore: Foreign language learning and identity reconstruction. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 219–42). Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (1997). Guest column: The privilege of the nonnative speaker. *PMLA*, *112*(3), 359–369.

Kramsch, C. (2000). Second language acquisition, applied linguistics, and the teaching of foreign languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, *84*(3), 311–326.

Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C., & von Hoene, L. (2001). Cross-cultural excursions: Foreign language study and feminist discourses of travel. In A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge, I. Piller, & M. Teutsch-Dwyer (Eds.), *Multilingualism, second language learning, and gender* (pp. 283–306). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kristeva, J. (1991). *Strangers to ourselves*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, J. (1993). *Nations without nationalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lam, W. S. E., & Kramsch, C. (2003). The ecology of an SLA community in a computer-mediated environment. In J. Leather & J. Van Dam (Eds.), *Ecology of language acquisition* (pp. 141–58). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lambert, W. E. (1990). Issues in foreign language and second language education. In *Proceedings of the First Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Students' Issues* (pp. 321–59). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Education.

Lantolf, J. P., & Genung, P. (2002). "I'd rather switch than fight": An activity-theory study of power, success, and failure in a foreign language. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language*

acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives (pp. 175–196). New York: Continuum.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997). Chaos/complexity science and second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, *18*(2), 141–165.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2002). Language acquisition and language use from a chaos/complexity theory perspective. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 33–46). New York: Continuum.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leather, J., & van Dam, J. (2003). Towards an ecology of language acquisition. In J. Leather & J. van Dam (Eds.), *Ecology of language acquisition* (pp. 1-29). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(3), 543–560.

Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*(3), 343–364.

Levine, G. S. (2009). Building meaning through code choice in second language learner interaction: A D/discourse analysis and proposals for curriculum design and teaching. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 145–162). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Levine, G. S. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent : Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Taylor and Francis.

Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy*. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.

Marton, F. (1981). Phenomenography: Describing conceptions of the world around us. *Instructional Science*, *10*, 177–200.

Maturana, H., & Varela, F. (1980). Autopoiesis and cognition: The realization of the living. Boston: D. Reidel Publishing.

Maturana, H., & Varela, F. (1987). *The tree of knowledge: The biological roots of human understanding*. Boston: Shambhala.

McCarthy, C. (1998). *The uses of culture: Education and the limits of ethnic affiliation*. New York: Routledge.

McMillan, B., & Turnbull, M. (2009). Teachers' use of the language in French immersion: Revisiting a core principle. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 15–34). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession*, *2007*(1), 234–245. doi:10.1632/prof.2007.2007.1.234

Nagy, K., & Robertson, D. (2009). Target language use in English classes in Hungarian primary schools. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 66–86). Tonawanda, New York: Multilingual Matters.

Ndura, E. (2004). ESL and cultural bias: An analysis of elementary through high school textbooks in the western United States of America. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *17*(2), 143–153. doi:10.1080/07908310408666689

Nocon, H. D. (1995). Is the word "Mexican" taboo? The impact of the border on Spanish students' integrative attitude and motivation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *114*, 47–66.

Norton, B. (2001). Non-participation, imagined communities and the language classroom. In M. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research* (pp. 159–171). New York: Longman.

Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43–72). New York: Academic Press.

Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity: Studies in the social and cultural foundations of language* (pp. 407–37). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oliver, D. W. (1989). *Education, modernity, and fractured meaning: Toward a process theory of teaching and learning*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ortega, L. (2005). Methodology, epistemology, and ethics in instructed SLA research: An introduction. *Modern Language Journal*, *89*(3), 317–327.

Osborn, T. A. (2000). *Critical reflection and the foreign language classroom*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Pavlenko, A., & Norton, B. (2007). Imagined communities, identity, and English language learning. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (Vol. 2, pp. 668–680). New York: Springer.

Phillipson, R. (2009). English in globalisation, a lingua franca or a lingua Frankensteinia? *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a Second Dialect*, *43*(2), 335–339.

Phillipson, R., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1996). English only worldwide or language ecology? *TESOL Quarterly*, *30*(3), 429–452.

Polio, C. G., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *Modern Language Journal*, *78*(3), 313.

Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession*, 33–40.

Rampton, B. (1999). Dichotomies, difference, and ritual in second language learning and teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, *20*(3), 316–340.

Reagan, T. G., & Osborn, T. A. (2002). *The foreign language educator in society: Toward a critical pedagogy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Riggins, S. H. (1997). The rhetoric of othering. In S. H. Riggins (Ed.), *The language and politics of exclusion: Others in discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sadker, D., & Sadker, M. (2001). Gender bias: From colonial America to today's classrooms. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed., pp. 125–151). New York: John Wiley.

Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.

San Miguel, G. J., & Valencia, R. R. (1998). From the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to Hopwood: The educational plight and struggle of Mexican Americans in the Southwest. *Harvard Educational Review*, *68*(3), 353–412.

Sapir, E. (1949). *Selected writings of Edward Sapir.* (D. G. Mandelbaum, Ed.). Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Schumann, J. H. (1978). The acculturation model for second-language acquisition. In R. C. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition & foreign language teaching* (pp. 27–50). Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. B. K. (2003). *Discourses in place: Language in the material world*. New York: Routledge.

Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher*, *27*(2), 4–13.

Shardakova, M., & Pavlenko, A. (2004). Identity options in Russian textbooks. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *3*(1), 25–46.

Shumway, N. (1995). Searching for Averroes: Reflections on why it is desirable and impossible to teach culture in foreign language courses. In C. J. Kramsch (Ed.), *Redefining the boundaries of language study* (pp. 251–260). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Silverman, D. (1998). *Harvey Sacks: Social science and conversation analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In K. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 9-44). Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.

Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for second language learning: Introduction to a general theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sridhar, S. N. (1994). A reality check for SLA theories. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(4), 800–805.

Texas Education Agency (TEA). (2010, April 25). Languages other than English - Frequently asked questions. Retrieved January 18, 2014, from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=5714#1

Thomas, G. (1991). *Linguistic Purism*. New York: Longman.

Train, R. (2007). "Real Spanish:" Historical perspectives on the ideological construction of a (foreign) language. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *4*(2-3), 207–235.

Tyack, D. (1974). The one best system: A history of American urban education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Valdes, G. (1998). The construct of the near-native speaker in the foreign language profession: Perspectives on ideologies about language. *Profession*, 151–160.

Valdes, G. (2000). Nonnative English speakers: Language bigotry in English mainstream classrooms. *ADE Bulletin*, (124), 12–17.

Valdés, G. (1997). Bilinguals and bilingualism: language policy in an anti-immigrant age. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *127*, 25–52.

Valdés, G. (2005). Bilingualism, heritage language learners, and SLA research: Opportunities lost or seized? *Modern Language Journal*, *89*(3), 410–426.

Valdés, G., & Figueroa, R. A. (1994). *Bilingualism and testing: A special case of bias*. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Valdes, G., Gonzalez, S. V., Garcia, D. L., & Marquez, P. (2003). Language ideology: The case of Spanish in departments of foreign languages. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *34*(1), 3–26.

Van Dam, J. (2003). Language acquisition behind the scenes: Collusion and play in educational settings. In J. Leather & J. van Dam (Eds.), *Ecology of language acquisition* (pp. 203–221). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: awareness, autonomy, and authenticity*. New York: Longman.

Van Lier, L. (2002). An ecological-semiotic perspective on language and linguistics. In C. J. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: ecological perspectives* (pp. 140–64). New York: Continuum.

Van Lier, L. (2003). A tale of two computer classrooms: The ecology of project-based language learning. In J. Leather & J. Van Dam (Eds.), *Ecology of language acquisition* (pp. 49–63). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Van Lier, L. (2011). Classrooms, and "real" worlds: Boundaries, roadblocks, and connections. In G. S. Levine & A. Phipps (Eds.), *AAUSC 2010: Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (1st ed., pp. 32–42). Boston: Heinle.

Varela, F., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1993). *The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience*. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T Press.

Von Hoene, L. (1995). Subjects-in-process: Revisioning TA development through psychoanalytic, feminist, and postcolonial theory. In C. J. Kramsch (Ed.), *Redefining the boundaries of language study* (pp. 39–57). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Von Hoene, L. (1999). Imagining otherwise: Rethinking departments of foreign languages and literatures as departments of cross-cultural difference. *ADFL Bulletin*, *Winter (1999)*, 226–229.

Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *The aims of education & other essays*. London: Williams & Norgate limited.

Whitehead, S. J. (2013). It will be so much better (in English)!: Uses of Spanish and English in a foreign language classroom. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *10*(2), 123–136.

Wing, B. (1987). The linguistic and communicative function of foreign language teacher talk. In B. VanPatten, T. Dvorta, & J. Lee (Eds.), *Foreign language learning: A research perspective* (pp. 158–73). New York: Newbury House.

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about- a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1–13). London: SAGE Publications.

Zentella, A. C. (1997). The hispanophobia of the official English movement in the US. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *127*, 71–86.